

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07097048 8





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

VOL. CXV.

JULY—OCTOBER, 1894.

LONDON :
BURNS & OATES, LIMITED. J. DONOVAN, 19 HENRIETTA STREET, W.C.
DUBLIN : M. H. GILL & SON.
NEW YORK, CINCINNATI & CHICAGO : BENZIGER BROTHERS.

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JULY 1894.

ART. I.—WILLIAM GEORGE WARD.

William George Ward and the Oxford Movement. By WILFRID WARD. With a portrait engraved from a miniature by Miss EMILY COMBE. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1889.

William George Ward and the Catholic Revival. By WILFRID WARD. With portrait from a bust by MARIO RAGGI. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1893.

IT would, I believe, be impossible to fix upon any period in the English history of the present century which has been more written, spoken, and thought about than the twelve years which elapsed between 1833 and 1845. The first of these years witnessed Keble's Assize Sermon; the second saw the admission of Newman into the Fold of Christ; while the intervening period abounded in events which profoundly and permanently changed the face of the National Church. From the influence of these events it is not too much to say that no educated mind has been, for good or evil, wholly exempt. With that influence every writer on the history of theological and ecclesiastical thought has had, for the last half century, to reckon; while even the exponents of the most advanced latitudinarian school owe something of their vigour to the reaction against Church authority and the principle of dogma, which the Oxford Movement, in its ebb, inevitably produced in so many minds. That great movement, indeed, was set for the

[No. 11 of Fourth Series.]

"fall and rising of many." It broke for ever the sleep, which had nearly sunk into the death, of Protestant Christianity in the eighteenth and the beginning of the present century. It brought to an age which had scarcely ceased to regard religious earnestness as synonymous with dissent, the desire to restore the Catholic elements which distinguished the age of Land. In its later development, and as the logical outcome of its earlier stage, it held up before the people of England the beauty of the Catholic Church as it had existed before the revolt of the sixteenth century; and for the chosen few it remained to realise that the flowers and fruit for which they yearned so greatly, and whose loss they so profoundly deplored, could never grow upon a severed branch, and could only be gathered from the parent stem of the one Catholic and Roman Church.

As Newman, Froude, Pusey, and Keble will ever be regarded as the authors of the first and historical phase of the Oxford Movement, so must the subject of these volumes be recognised as the potent factor in its second, and final stage. Ward found the movement Anglican—he left it Roman. It was through him, in great measure, that it changed its skin; and the lifeless coil which it then cast aside has since served as the covering in which the High Church party has masqueraded as Catholic.

Of the earlier part of the Oxford Movement and of his own great share in it, Cardinal Newman has long since given us the history in a volume which will hold its place in the literature of England for all time, though he has, with characteristic generosity, spared from a concurrent and unenviable immortality the reckless accuser to whom the volume was originally due. (And after all one may value a diamond pin without caring to preserve the beetle which it has transfixed.)

But until the appearance of these volumes, no adequate memorial had, so far as we know, been published, detailing the later developments of Tractarianism, and of the subsequent career of William George Ward, to whom so large a share in those developments must be ascribed.

The two books which we have named at the head of this article not only supply this want, but supply it most abundantly. Their author had of course a tale of surpassing

interest to unfold, a tale in every sense congenial to his pen, and one with which, from close intercourse with his illustrious father, he had become thoroughly familiar. But even this will not fully account for the admirable manner in which he has achieved his work. To our minds Mr. Wilfrid Ward has shown that he possesses that unmistakable note of genius which enables a writer to live in the places and times of which he writes, and, what is still more rare, to take his readers along with him. It is only fair to add that his style is vigorous, terse and limpid, so that one need never look back to ascertain the full bearing of any sentence, which is surely no slight achievement, especially where, as in the second of these volumes, questions of philosophy and metaphysics are being discussed.

Neither have we here a mere panegyric of a father by his son. Without in any case overstepping the line of filial respect, our author has drawn a living portrait of William George Ward, as so many of us remember him ; with his faith, his strong manly piety, his impetuous loyalty, his humility, which sometimes amounted, in describing his own foibles, to brutal candour, his delightfully unabashed, but severely critical, avowal of his intellectual powers, his love of fun, and playful paradox ; in a word, his altogether unique personality, mental and physical. And in no *Review* can a more cordial and appropriate welcome be given to such a picture than in the DUBLIN, with which the name of Ward was for so many years intimately associated as proprietor and editor.

In a word, these volumes appear to us the models of what a biography should be ; while the first of them, in its masterly presentment of the University as it was half a century ago, forms a true *locus classicus* for the history of the Oxford Movement.

William George Ward was born on March 21, 1812. The earliest records of him which are extant tell us that, even as a boy, he showed a remarkable talent for mathematics as well as the passionate love of all things dramatic and musical, which distinguished him in after life. His mathematical powers recall the *génie affreux* of Pascal, for we are told that at the age of nine, Ward "found out the principle of logarithms, and applied it for himself with considerable skill." Other

characteristics which belonged to him as a man, also appeared thus early ; for instance, his intense hatred for what is known as "general society"—causing him, when asked by his hostess how he was enjoying a children's party to which he had been forced to go, to reply, with more truth than politeness, "I expected to find it a bore, but now that I am here I find it even worse than I had thought." So terrible, indeed, did the boredom become, that the poor boy literally bolted, getting home as best he could through mud, rain and darkness, at the cost of a pair of evening shoes.

At eleven years of age he was sent to Winchester, at which so many of the future converts received their education, though his only schoolfellow of note who afterwards became a Catholic seems to have been the late Lord Emly. Other distinguished Wykehamites who were at school with Ward were the future Lords Sherbrooke and Selborne, and Anthony Trollope.

It does not in the least surprise us to hear that his school-days were not happy. It is questionable whether a genius was ever happy amongst a multitude of boys, the vast majority of whom must of course be of a common-place, conventional type, whose ideal of greatness consists in the possession of thew and sinew. Ward seems, however, to have been well liked by his companions, the result, no doubt in part, of his imperturbable good humour, to which Lord Selborne bears witness in a few memories which he has supplied for this biography. An instance at once of his mathematical acumen and of that intense "cocksureness" which characterised him all through life, will raise a smile on those who knew him in later days :

"I don't know why it is," he said on one occasion to his mathematical tutor, who found fault with his answer to some problem, "but when I see that my answer to a sum is right, I don't care if all the world says it's wrong. I *know* it's right."—"W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement," p. 7.

He was less successful as a versifier, though he was called upon when at Winchester to practise the art. But two of the specimens preserved in this book are worth quoting. A poem on "The Spanish Captives Sacrificed to the Mexican God of War," begins thus :

Far from a *merry key* I now must sing,
Though to *America* my muse takes wing.

And in describing the "Mariner's Compass," he found that the minimum number of lines (which he never exceeded) were almost written without any description having been given of the "useful instrument," a deficiency which he tersely and wittily supplied thus :

The various points and quarters of the sky
Are painted on a card beneath a hole.
Atop's a magnet pointing to the pole.

"W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement," pp. 9, 10.

Even in his early boyhood the moods of intense melancholy which afflicted him in later years visited him frequently, forming, as he himself expressed it, "the background of his life"; while he was also tortured by constant headaches. We read of his confiding to his sister, as a child, "that he thought life altogether so melancholy that he wished to be out of it," (p. 18). The present writer well remembers a description which Ward gave, at a dinner-party in his own house, of one of these fits of depression. "A poor dog had to be shot that day, and as I watched the men from my window preparing for the execution, I was inclined to envy the dog!" And then—a playful gleam, suddenly and unexpectedly lighting up his face—he added: "How can life be even tolerable when one is liable to meet a fellow like K.?" turning to a guest who sat near him, and who was quite unprepared for the onslaught. There were two things which gave him relief from his melancholy—religion and music. While still at Winchester he showed signs of the deep religious nature which prompted him to live entirely for God. A governess who was engaged to teach his sisters, though she seems in other respects to have been dull and commonplace, so attracted him by her strong evangelical piety, that his mother used to say that he was in love with her. He possessed an abiding sense of the seriousness of life, and of the paramount importance of religion which was in a schoolboy almost phenomenal; while his horror of anything like immorality was equally strong.

Of his love of music we shall have occasion to speak later on. It was far more for him than a mere pleasure or recreation. The refreshment and relief which it brought were so immense to one whose "ill-health . . . prevented his ever

enjoying a day of real comfort," that it is permissible to doubt whether, without its aid, he could have carried the burden of his laborious life.

In October 1830 Ward went up to Christ Church. The change from school to college was a great joy to him, and he seems to have thrown himself with zest into the debates at the Union, of which society he was later the president. Indeed, in his early University career, politics seem to have been his great interest, as was not unnatural, seeing that so many of his fellow-students from Winchester were looking forward to a Parliamentary life. "The walking incarnation of the Union," as Cardwell called Ward, rapidly made his name as a speaker, fluent, clear, and earnest, giving the impression of being "thoroughly convinced that he was right."

In 1833 he stood for a scholarship at Lincoln, for which he was unanimously elected. But though, to a man of his singular abilities, a double first was within reach, Ward could not be induced to work at anything which was "out of his line," and on the eve of the examination was found reading one of Miss Austen's novels instead of some specially important formulæ in mechanics. In the interval between his classical and mathematical examinations he was elected to an open Fellowship at Balliol. An incident in his classical examination is so eminently characteristic of the man that we shall be pardoned for quoting it at length.

One of Cicero's letters to his brother Quintus is chosen, and the examiner tells Ward to turn to a particular part. Ward reads it admirably, his voice being excellent, his intonation and inflections faultless, and his sense of the meaning and spirit of the passage leaving nothing to be desired. Attention is aroused. The audience—consisting of a large number of undergraduates and a good sprinkling of dons—is on the *qui vive*. Here is a first-rate man evidently. The construing comes next, which, if not quite so exceptionally good as the reading, still quite bears out the expectation of a display of first-class ability. The examiner, in obvious good humour, says at the end, "Very well, Mr. Ward, and now let me ask you, What are the principal letters which we have now extant of Cicero? To whom were they written?"

Ward (without the slightest hesitation): "I really don't know." The examiner (surprised, and after a short pause): "The letter from which you have just construed a passage was written on the eve of a very eventful time; can you tell me something of the events which followed immediately afterwards?" Ward: "I know nothing whatever about

them." This was said with perfect gravity, and in a tone of philosophic resignation. "Take your time, Mr. Ward," says the examiner; "you are nervous." "No, sir," replies Ward, "it's not nervousness; pure ignorance." The examiner made another attempt. "In what year was it written?" Ward (with energy): "I haven't the slightest idea." (Father Faber used to say that as the examination proceeded he began to give his answers in a tone of resentment, as though the questions were impertinent ones.)—"W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement," p. 27.

The celebrated Dr. Jenkyns remarked upon the wonderful straightforwardness of the candidate in a malaprop which has become historical, "there is a candid *ingenuity* about the fellow which pleases me." Long afterwards, when Ward had resigned his two Balliol lectureships on account of his defence of Tract 90, Dr. Jenkyns, the Master of the College, though admiring Ward's conduct, was not so much "pleased with the fellow's" outspoken writings as he had been with his former "*ingenuity* in speech." He even

shed tears at the final interview, and is very much disturbed about it. It is said that he is overheard grumbling to himself, "I wish Mrs Jenkyns would take care of the flowers instead of the cabbages" . . . and then in the next breath, "I wish Mr. Ward would not write such pamphlets."—"Life and Letters of A. P. Stanley," vol. i. p. 297.

However, these early days of his Oxford life contained nothing to make people suspect that he would ever become a disciple of Newman. It was in 1834, and in Faber's rooms, that he first saw his lifelong friend Arthur Penrhyn Stanley. It was probably Ward's intense admiration for Arnold that first attracted him to the future Dean of Westminster. Stanley thus describes his first sight of him:

There bounced in on Sunday a huge moon-faced man, Ward, once of Christ Church, now of Lincoln. . . . It seems that he idolises Whately, and Arnold almost, though not quite as much, purely from their books, without any knowledge of them. I have seen a good deal of him since. It would have done your heart good to have seen the unfeigned envy with which he regarded me as the depository of so much *νόμος ἄγραφος*; as having actually lived with the great man [Arnold].—"Life and Letters of A. P. Stanley," vol. i. pp. 130, 131.

The tone of mind indicated in this quotation lasted until 1838, in which year Ward began to yield himself entirely to the spell which Newman was destined, in spite of differences of opinion, to exercise over him for the remainder of his life.

It is a curious fact that Oriel was the birthplace of the two schools of thought which divided the Church of England—the school of Arnold and that of Newman and Pusey; for the great headmaster of Rugby did no doubt owe a great deal of the characteristics of his teaching to Oriel, and, in Oriel, to Whately and Bentham. But besides these there was in the same college, in Arnold's time, a greater man than either—John Keble, "the true and primary author," as Cardinal Newman calls him, of the Tractarian Movement.

The late Dean of St. Paul's held that it was owing to Keble's influence that Arnold escaped what has been called the Noetic tone which characterised Whately. And certainly Arnold's pupils, although destined to be poles asunder from Newman and the other Tractarians, managed to invest the Liberal party in Oxford "with an elevation of character which claimed the respect even of its opponents."

In a chapter of extreme ability and clearness Mr. Wilfrid Ward has described the intellectual and religious tone which possessed his father in his early Oxford days. The teachings of Bentham, Mill and Whately had aroused his keenest admiration, and it was probably to the influence of these men that he owed the clear, luminous and trenchant logic which in his Catholic days rendered him such a redoubtable champion of the Church against the positivist philosophy of the day. His very love for the exactitude of mathematics made him hate what was "misty," hazy and mysterious, and it was these very tendencies which at first repelled him in (what he thought to be) the teaching of the Tractarian leaders. Then the headlong robustness of Arnold, his undoubtedly genuine piety, the high standard of his aspirations, enchanted Ward and took him captive, as the coldness of the Whately school could never have done. The Tractarians, with their reverence for antiquity, and their sacerdotal principles, were directly opposed to Arnold and his anti-dogmatism; and so harmful did Ward consider the Tracts, that he and Tait had it at one time in mind to issue an antidote in the shape of publications of their own.

No one who has read Arnold's life will be at all surprised that the high standard of his ethics attracted Ward; his estimation of virtue as superior to intellect helped to represent

a reality which to Ward's mind was an engaging contrast to what he believed then to be the formalism of the Tractarian school. It was only when it became clear that Newman represented a still higher ethical idea that Ward became his disciple. On the eve of his withdrawal from Arnold's school he determined to seek at Rugby an interview with the great headmaster, and an amusing description is given by our author of this momentous conversation. It took place in the evening, when Arnold was jaded with the day's work. Ward had waited for his host since early in the day, and had refreshed alike his mind and body by reading novels on a sofa. The discussion which followed entirely failed to satisfy the visitor, who went away more burdened with sceptical difficulties than when he came; while Arnold was so thoroughly exhausted that he had to spend the following day in his bed!

It would perhaps be idle to speculate as to what would have been Ward's future career if at this moment he had not come across the commanding personality of John Henry Newman. But to show that, even after his breach with Arnoldism, he lent no willing ear at first to the leader who was so profoundly to influence his life, we have only to quote the words he used when asked to attend one of Newman's sermons in St. Mary's. "Why should I go and listen to such myths?" he said. How this position of his mind was brought to an abrupt end, may be told in the words of Professor Price which were written for this work:

Newman [he says], preached regularly on Sunday afternoons at five o'clock from St. Mary's pulpit. His sermons, as is well known, excited an interest as widely spread as it was keen amongst his audience—eager to hear more, sharply stirred up by the genius, the delicacy and subtlety of thought, the intense religious feeling, and above all by the flashes of unspeakable mystery which pervaded his utterances. The excitement they created scattered waves of feeling far beyond the precincts of the University. Ward was often pressed to go and hear them, but he impetuously refused. "Why should I go and listen to such myths?" What he heard of the nature and effects of these sermons revolted him. At last one of his friends laid a plot against him. He invited him to take a walk and brought him to the porch of St. Mary's Church precisely as the clock was striking five. "Now, Ward," said he, "Newman is at this moment going up into his pulpit. Why should you not enter and hear him once? It can do you no harm. If you don't like the preaching you need not go a second time, but do hear and judge what the thing is

like." By the will of God Ward was persuaded and he entered the church. . . . That sermon changed his whole life."

From that day it is not difficult to trace the process of intellectual and religious investigation which ultimately landed Ward in the Catholic Church. At first, of course, his difficulties remained, though he could not help acknowledging the personal charm of Newman himself. Many were the billows which had still to be encountered before the harbour was reached. But it is intensely interesting to the student of Ward's character to note how, when his intellect once became convinced, he not merely followed Newman, but in a certain sense, led him also. Or, if that be too much to say, he surely precipitated events by the *élan* of his impetuous nature and by his ruthless logic, as the French by the premature firing of their outposts brought about the battle of Woerth.

For Ward no such thing as the *Via Media* was possible, except indeed as a step to something else. To his mind the Reformers, if they could not be justified must be unequivocally condemned. This condemnation was pronounced indeed by two of the Tractarian leaders in 1838, on the publication of "Froude's Remains," a book in which, says the late Lord Blachford, Ward found "a good deal of his own Radicalism (though nothing at all of his own Utilitarianism or Liberalism) and it seemed *literally* to make him jump for joy." In it Ward found a rule of faith, the hope of an authority which should free him from those dark, perplexing and semi-sceptical speculations which had been harassing his mind hitherto.

Froude's writing recommended itself to Mr. Ward as having the attribute of Lord Strafford's Irish policy. It was thorough. And in opposition to this Arnold's system stopped short at every turn. Froude's picture of the medieval Church was that of an absolute, independent spiritual authority, direct, uncompromising, explicit in its decrees, in contrast with the uncertain voice of the English Church with its hundred shades of opinions differing from and even opposed to each other. Instead of groping with the feeble light of human reason amid texts of uncertain signification, he interpreted Scripture by the aid of constant tradition, and of the Church's divine illumination.—"W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement," p. 85.

And yet the man whose "Remains" these were, died a protestant! Who can doubt that, had he lived to be even a middle-aged man, he would have submitted to the Church

which he so much revered? The wonder is how it was that, believing and seeing as he did, he failed to discern that the Church of England could be no part of this true Kingdom of Heaven, that its very Erastianism, which is not accidental but essential to its existence, precluded the possibility of its being part of the Church founded by Jesus Christ as a Kingdom apart from all other kingdoms. For what was Froude's view but the expression, in other words, of the sentence which, according to Cardinal Newman, "absolutely pulverized" the *Via Media*, "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum!*"

But so it was—and, wonderful as it may seem to those who have spent their lives in the Catholic Church, Froude and others failed to see that a condition of communion with that Church was submission to her visible head. It was years before either Newman or Ward saw that the rags and tatters of Catholicism which existed in the Church of England could not make it a part of the Church Catholic. It was these very fragments of the old Catholic tradition which for some time kept Ward from Rome. While the enemies of Tractarianism hated the system because they believed it would lead men to "Popery," it was all the time hindering at least one man from entering the Church. Much as he longed for Rome, wistfully as he gazed upon her matchless unity, her transcendent doctrinal sanctity, her calm and majestic dominion, he felt it a duty to remain an Anglican until he could convince himself that the Church of England formed no part of the true Church. Hear what he says as early as the year 1841—four years before his conversion—"Restoration of active communion with the Roman Church is the most enchanting earthly prospect on which my imagination can dwell." This, of course, means a corporate and not an individual "restoration of union," but it proves abundantly that Ward was held back from the step he afterwards took by the belief that Anglicanism was a branch of the Church (though in these days he did also believe that things inside the Church must be modified before a "re-union" could take place). And the tracts were the chief factors in preserving this view. That the Tractarian Movement, by re-instilling Catholicism into the Anglican Church, would result in the ultimate union of that Church with Rome, he did not doubt. But he considered it wrong "by any hasty

step on the part of individuals to frustrate so glorious a prospect" (p. 150).

All depended, therefore, upon the power of the new school to restore Catholicism to the Anglican Church. But the question was how far the receptivity of the Anglican Church would go. If it were really part of the kingdom founded by Christ, it would surely imbibe and incorporate doctrine after doctrine and custom after custom which assimilated it to the Primitive Church. If, on the other hand, it was essentially Protestant, it would shrink from anything Catholic as the evil spirits shrank before the visible presence of Our Lord. The Tractarians were loading the Church of England with Catholic doctrine. If she were true sterling metal she would stand the charge. If she were, on the other hand, ill-cast, ill-founded and rotten, she would burst asunder.

The question of the Articles was one which necessarily presented itself to everyone seeking orders. In what sense were they to be subscribed? In Ward's view, they had not necessarily been drawn up to condemn authoritative Catholic teachings, and most assuredly not to condemn the Tridentine Decrees, seeing that they were anterior to the Council of Trent. Were they not rather aimed at popular corruptions? Ward held that they might have been so aimed. Cardinal Newman has told Mr. Wilfrid Ward that in the latter part of the year 1840, Ward was "almost daily in his rooms at Oriel, discussing the prospects and programme of the movement. Newman appears to have seen that with Ward and with others it was gradually becoming a choice between explicit recognition" of an elastic view of the Articles, and actual submission to Rome. And according to our author, it was this state of things which led to the publication of Tract 90.

The storm which arose over this pamphlet is remembered of course to this day. Cardinal Newman had not anticipated that its appearance would create any great stir, but Ward and others more correctly gauged the feeling of the University, and, according to Oakeley, it had not been published many days before Oxford was "in a fever of excitement. It was bought with such avidity that the very presses were taxed almost beyond their powers to meet the exigencies of the demand. Edition followed edition by days rather than by weeks; and it

was not very long before Mr. Newman, as I have heard, realised money enough, by the sale of this shilling pamphlet, to purchase a valuable library."

Mr. James Mozley, writing to his sister immediately after the publication of the tract, says :

It is on the Articles, and shows that they bear a highly Catholic meaning; and that many doctrines of which the Romanist are corruptions, may be held consistently with them. This is no more than what we know as a matter of history, for the Articles were expressly worded to bring in Roman Catholics. But people are astonished and confused at the idea now, as if it were quite new.

This storm of course brought Ward into the field, not only to defend his revered leader from the charge of disingenuousness, but to bring into clearer relief the line of the argument. Two pamphlets from his pen—"A Few Words," and "A Few Words more—in Defence of Tract 90"—appeared in rapid succession. Their tendency was not likely to make his position as Lecturer at Balliol a more comfortable one, and Tait and others among the Fellows pressed upon the Master that their author was not a suitable teacher for young men. We have already seen how the amiable gentleman, Dr. Jenkyns, on this occasion mixed up complaints about his garden with those connected with Ward's views. As in duty bound, he now tried to master the contents of the pamphlets, and was found one day fast asleep in his arm-chair with one of them, a closely printed book of ninety pages, on his knee. But passages were brought to his notice which impelled him to the disagreeable task of calling upon their author to resign his lectureship. Yet it went sadly against the grain. "Really Tait," he said, "when I meet Ward and talk to him, I find him so amusing and so agreeable, that it is almost impossible to believe that he is the same man who says those *dreadful* things in print." Still his conscience would not allow him to let things remain as they were. "What *heresy* may he not insinuate under the form of a syllogism!" And the Doctor was on the point of acting, when Ward himself came to his relief. He had heard of the Master's wishes, and understood that he was bound to take steps against him. He therefore resigned the lectureship. "Really, Ward," said Jenkyns, with an outburst of gratitude, "this is just like your generosity."

No wonder that Ward's friends were alarmed. Already they feared that the step which he took four years later was imminent, and Dr. Pusey, through Oakeley, asked for a distinct pledge that he would not join the Roman Church, a pledge which Ward declined to give, though he added that secession was far from his thoughts.

The rift between the old Tractarian party and the new, became wider and more unmistakable. In the correspondence which ensued between Ward and Pusey, the former claimed that his opinions had the sanction of Newman. Whether this was accurate or not, we may gather from the "Apologia" that its author had a suspicion that the party represented by Ward might be right after all. And to bring matters to a head, Ward expressed his willingness to abandon any opinion if it could be shown that Newman disapproved of it.

With regard [he writes to Pusey] to Newman's sanction of "A Few Words more in Defence of Tract 90" he told me that he did not know a single sentiment expressed in it in which he did not altogether concur. He said that I had my way of saying things and he his, and that his was a very different way from mine; but this is connected with the manner, not matter.—"W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement," p. 176.

Tract 90 had indeed brought about a change in the movement which was permanent. Before its appearance, Mr. Anthony Froude tells us that

Rome was never spoken of as the probable goal of any but a few foolish young men, whose presence would be injurious to any cause, and who were therefore better in the enemy's camp than at home, and no worldly interests had yet been threatened with damage, except perhaps the Friday dinner and the Lent second course.*

But now all this was changed.

An informal inquisition was established, and clerical and academical preferment became dependent on a disavowal of the opinions expressed in the tracts. It became necessary to surrender tutorships, fellowships, and the hopes of them; to find difficulties in getting ordained, to lose slowly the prospects of pleasant curacies and livings, and parsonage houses, and the sweet little visions of home paradises, a serious thing to young High Churchmen, who were commonly of the amiable enthusiastic sort, and so, of course, had fallen, most of them, into early engagements and from this time the leader's followers began to lag behind.—"Text and Quotation," pp. 185, 186.

* Quoted on p. 185 of "W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement."

As I have tried to explain above, the tract had been designed to prove that Ward, and those who shared his views, could still remain in the Church of England. If the tract were so accepted by that community, there would be no reason for these men to leave it; indeed their duty, as they then saw it, would be to remain where they were. But the rejection of the tract was not merely, by God's grace, the means of leading many into the Catholic Church, but it also set on foot a sort of test, informal and unofficial, but at the same time efficacious, in the way of those who desired a clerical career.

Meanwhile matters advanced to what an outsider might have seen was their inevitable conclusion. A long series of articles by Ward in the *British Critic* must have partly prepared men's minds for the culminating point in his Anglican writings, the appearance of the "Ideal," a title which, partly from the momentous events which followed its publication, and partly as suggesting a playful contrast to the author's figure, clung to him as a friendly *soubriquet* through life.

The book was a reply to a publication by Mr. William Palmer (of Worcester) called "Narrative of Events connected with the Tracts for the Times." Mr. Palmer was so much horrified by Ward's writings in the *British Critic*, in which, "by Newman's principle this audacious intellect [Ward] was set free to deal with religion according to the bent of his genius," that he called upon Newman, represented to him the offence which the articles had caused, and begged him to exert his influence as editor to suppress any future teaching of a similar kind. But Newman explained that he was no longer editor,

that the heads of the Church had thought fit to condemn him and to destroy his usefulness; that they had silenced him, and that they would now have to deal with younger men, whom it was not in his power to restrain; that they would in future have to deal with a different class of men. He finally declared his resolution not to interfere.—"W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement," pp. 243, 244.

The failure of this interview caused Mr. Palmer to write the book which we have mentioned above. In it he reviews the progress of religious thought and of the Oxford Movement, of course from his own point of view, which was vehemently opposed to the later developments of that great crisis. It was

this pamphlet which was the occasion, if not exactly the cause, of Ward's famous book—"The Ideal of a Christian Church." Indeed, the title-page of this work announced that it contained "a defence of certain articles in the *British Critic* in reply to remarks on them in Mr. Palmer's 'Narrative.'" The "Ideal" was evidently intended to be, what it in fact became, the touchstone of Ward's ecclesiastical position. Replying to a remark of F. Whitty, who had expressed surprise at his remaining in the Protestant Church when he was really a Catholic in all but the name, Ward said: "You Catholics know what it is to have a Pope. Well, Newman is my Pope. Without his sanction I cannot move." But he admitted the anomalousness of his position, though he defended it logically.

We have seen [writes Mr. Wilfrid Ward] that it depended on the lawfulness of holding all Roman doctrine while still an Anglican. Still this theory might be at any moment condemned by the English authorities and so become no longer tenable; and he allowed the desirableness of having a pronouncement from them one way or the other (p. 240).

I give this sentence as it stands, partly because it is beyond my intelligence to grasp its meaning. To my mind it involves a contradiction in terms. To be an Anglican and "to hold all Roman doctrine" at one and the same time, is no more possible than it would be to be simultaneously in Terra del Fuego and in Rome. To be an Anglican is to be cut off from visible communion with the Church. The Church teaches that it is necessary (except in cases of invincible ignorance) for every one to be within her visible communion. To be outside is to be cut off from the ordained channels of grace. If this be a doctrine of the Church, no one could believe "all Roman doctrine," and at the same time deny it; and its acceptance would of course preclude him *ipso facto* from remaining an Anglican. Compared with this view, the question whether the "English authorities" would or would not "condemn" a position so fraught with contradiction, sinks into utter insignificance. However, the touchstone was near at hand in the shape of a pamphlet, "fast becoming a fat book."

This was the "Ideal of a Christian Church," and it was written, as Ward avowed, in the hope of bringing matters to an issue. And to an issue, as all the world knows, it speedily brought them.

I do not propose to follow our author in the elaborate analysis which he has most rightly inserted of his father's book. We prefer to hasten on to the events which succeeded its publication. And first—as the oysters before the dinner—let us see what effect it had upon our old friend Dr. Jenkyns :

It is said that he was found pacing up and down his room with the book in his hand, shortly after its appearance, quoting in accents of astonishment and horror some of its strong expressions. “We are a corrupted Church!” “We are in a degraded condition!” “We are to mourn our corruptions in penitential abasement!” “We are to sue for pardon at the feet of Rome humbly”; and then the word *humbly* he repeated, in a yet deeper tone of horror. Mr. Ward was once more summoned into the Master's presence. His tutorship was already gone, and now he was forbidden to act, as he had done for some years, as deputy-chaplain for Mr. Oakeley, and to read morning and evening prayers. This prohibition was made shortly before the feast of SS. Simon and Jude in 1844. On that day, in the ordinary course of things, he was to read the Epistle at the Communion service on one side of the Communion table, while Dr. Jenkyns, as senior ecclesiastic, read the Gospel at the other side. Mr. Ward himself expected some sort of protest from the Master, and he was not disappointed. A scene long remembered by the undergraduates who were present followed. Directly the Master saw Mr. Ward advancing to the Epistle side of the table he shot forth from his place and rushed to the Gospel side, and just as Mr. Ward was beginning, commenced in his loudest tones: “The Epistle is read in the first chapter of St. Jude.” Mr. Ward made no further attempt to continue, and the Master, now thoroughly roused, read at him across the Communion table. The words of the Epistle were singularly appropriate to the situation, and the Master, with ominous pauses and looks at the irreverent Puseyite, who had sown sedition in the Church and blasphemed the heads of houses, read as follows slowly and emphatically: “For there are certain men crept in unawares [pause, and look at Mr. Ward] who were before of old ordained unto this condemnation [pause and look] ungodly men” [pause and look]; and a little later, still more slowly and bitterly, he read, “they speak evil of dignities!” These scenes, which were remembered by the young members of the party as the lighter and more amusing side of the drama of the movement, are said to have really told painfully on the spirits of the kind-hearted Master. He had a genuine and cordial affection for Ward, and, entirely unable as he was to understand the line he adopted, seems to have felt towards him as a father towards a son whom he has cared for and taken a pride in, and who at last robs and forges and goes thoroughly to the bad. A year later, after Mr. Ward had left Balliol and married, an old college servant who was much attached to the Master said to Mrs. Ward in tones of deep feeling, “Oh, ma'am, I'm so glad you've taken Mr. Ward away.

You don't know—he was leading the poor Master such a life of it.”—
 “W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement,” pp. 324, 325.

The “Ideal” excited world-wide interest. It affected men of essentially different opinions and intellectual bias. The *Edinburgh* held it up triumphantly as an illustration of what Puseyism was coming to; in the *Quarterly* it was attacked by Mr. Gladstone. It was read by persons as far asunder as Keble, Mill, Sir William Hamilton, Döllinger, and Comte. But no official notice was taken of the book by the University until six months after its appearance. Then, it was not only proposed to censure and degrade Ward, but to institute a test as well. But this latter step was found impracticable, and was afterwards abandoned.

On February 13 Convocation met, and certain chosen passages from the “Ideal” were proposed for censure. The censure was carried. Then it was moved that the author of these passages had forfeited his degrees of B.A. and M.A. This, too, was carried, but by a smaller majority. Ward spoke in his own defence for more than an hour “with remarkable rapidity, but at the same time with great calmness and self-possession, with the air of a man, in fact, who felt a deep conviction that he was right.” The boldness of the speech must have startled Oxford beyond all words.

It had little in it that was conciliatory. Even when his argument was strongest and most convincing, and his delivery most forcible, he would remind his hearers—*parenthetically*, as Professor Jowett tells me—that he held the “whole cycle of Roman doctrine.” To its power many who remember it testify in strong terms. Stanley, who was standing near Jowett, said to him, “They would never have let Ward speak in English if they had known how well he could speak.” But his whole defence implied and expressed as its sole ground the unwelcome assumption of the hopelessly illogical character of the English Church. His judges were, he maintained, utterly unjustified, in all consistency of logic, in condemning him, because the Church to which they belonged was itself hopelessly inconsistent. If the rest of the Anglican formularies were consistent with the Articles, he had no *locus standi*. But amid a hopeless jumble of inconsistent pledges, he remained free and untrammelled; and the Church remained convicted of folly and self-contradiction.—“W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement,” pp. 340, 341.

The case supplies one more illustration of the impatience with which the Church of England regards Catholic teaching,

while it thinks little or nothing of heretical and Socinian tendencies; though it cannot be denied that his constant repetition of his belief in "all the doctrines of the Roman Church," a statement which, according to James Mozley, if he made once, he made twenty times in the course of his speech, was a pill too bitter to be swallowed by Convocation. Ward seems to have been in no way depressed by the degradation, and his good spirits even survived the fall in the snow, which tradition says he sustained when crossing the threshold of the Sheldonian. He was cheered by the undergraduates as he walked home in company with Tait, who, by the way, had voted against him on the first count. But before the termination of the proceedings, the proposal had been made to condemn Tract 90, which was defeated by the intervention of the Proctors.

When the resolution [against the Tract] was put a shout of *non* was raised, and resounded through the whole building, and *placets* from the other side, over which Guillemard's *nobis Procuratoribus non placet* was heard like a trumpet and cheered enormously. The Dean of Chichester threw himself out of his doctor's seat and shook both Proctors [Guillemard and Church] violently by the hand, and without any formal dissolution, indeed, without a word more being spoken, as if such an interposition [as the Proctors' *veto*] stopped all business, the Vice-Chancellor tucked up his gown, and hurried down the steps that led from his throne into the area, and hurried out of the theatre; and in five minutes the whole scene of action was cleared.—Mozley's "Letters," and the *Edinburgh Review* for April 1845. Quoted on p. 342.

The undergraduates who were cheering Ward, saluted the Vice-Chancellor with snow-balls and hisses.

On the afternoon of that eventful day, an incident occurred which was memorable in after days. Ward had gone to see Pusey, and was discussing some of the results of his altered position. What would Dr. Jenkyns say to his being a Fellow of Balliol, and yet an *undergraduate* also? What kind of dress was he to wear? His joking anticipations were interrupted by a voice,

which was heard to say in grave and measured accents: "The situation seems to me, Mr. Ward, to be one of the utmost gravity. It is indeed a serious crisis. Let us not at such a time give way to a spirit of levity or hilarity." The speaker was Archdeacon Manning, who had voted for Mr. Ward, but whose first personal introduction to him was on this occasion. Later in life he came, I think, to acquit Ward of levity, and to

enjoy a joke in the course of their theological discussions. The acquaintance thus begun grew in after years to relations of cordial intimacy, which lasted to the end of Ward's life.—“W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement,” p. 343.

The Convocation had taken place on February 13, 1845. Six weeks later Mr. Ward was married to Miss Wingfield, a lady who, as an ardent Puseyite and a disciple of Oakeley, had followed the events of Ward's career with the warmest interest and sympathy. In the following September, husband and wife were both received into the Catholic Church by Father Brownbill, in the temporary chapel of the Jesuit Fathers in Bolton Street. Their intention had it seems reached Oxford, and on the morning of their reception, their breakfast-table was covered with missives, serious and jocose, from members of the University. “Among others,” says our author, “was a parody of a well-known poem commencing thus :

O Wardie, I believed thee true,
And I was blessed in so believing;
But now I own I never knew
A youth so base and so deceiving.”

These lighter contributions to his breakfast-table Ward enjoyed thoroughly, while the graver remonstrances could only make him wish that their writers might share the peace and happiness which now filled his heart.

The new converts soon returned to Rose Hill, near Oxford, where they had fixed their abode on their marriage, and Father Whitty has given us a delightful picture of their home, where he also met Oakeley, now himself a Catholic.

Their whole tone of mind [he tells us] and perfect simplicity of piety, reminded me of sketches one reads of the early Christians. They were perfectly full of the great cause of the Church, of working for England's conversion, and seemed to care not at all for mere gossip or private matters.—“W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement,” p. 366.

I cannot refrain from quoting one remark which Ward's conversion elicited from Pusey, who was at the time he spoke grieving also at the loss of Newman, and at the final collapse of the Oxford Movement.

It is very sad [he remarked]. And all who have left us have deteriorated so much—all, that is, with two exceptions. One exception is Newman, whose nature is so beautiful, so perfect, that nothing, not even

going over to Rome, could change him. The other exception is Ward. Ward had got so bad already that with him further deterioration was impossible.

We may imagine with what fierce joy Ward used to quote this delightful *dictum*. And here it may not be out of place to note the very curious attitude of mind which Pusey exhibited in connection with Newman's conversion. He could not bring himself to think any evil of his dear friend (as who could, who knew him so intimately?), and yet, years before Newman's conversion, he had a fear that it might one day take place. And the reason for this fear seems to us as original as it was ingenious, while the revelation which it gives us of Pusey's utter incapacity to grasp the full meaning of a divinely founded Church, seems to explain in some measure how it was that he never followed Newman's example. He had heard that Newman was prayed for by name in religious houses and churches on the continent, and the fear came upon him lest, in reply to such earnest petitions, Newman might be given to them [the Catholics] as "an instrument of God's glory among them," and "that their prayers may be heard, that God will give them whom they pray for—we forfeit whom we desire not to retain."* And he adds:

And now (that Newman has left the Church of England) must they not think that their prayers which they have offered so long—at times I think night and day, or at the Holy Eucharist—have been heard? And may we not have forfeited him because there was, comparatively, so little love and prayer?†

Thus, according to this extraordinary theory, was Newman, in taking the step which brought him "perfect peace and contentment,"‡ in some sort, "Cursed with the burden of an Answered Prayer." But we must return to our subject. Ward had not been long a Catholic before he settled at Old Hall, in the neighbourhood of St. Edmund's College, with which his name was so long connected. An arrangement was come to which enabled him to lay out a legacy in the erection of a house, within the college park. His architect was Pugin, whose acquaintance he had made while still at Oxford. The

* *Vide* "Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey," by H. P. Liddon, D.D., vol. ii. p. 460.

† *Ibid.*

‡ "Apologia," p. 238.

"great Goth," as he has been humorously styled, had marvelled "that so glorious a man as Ward should be living in a room without mullions to the windows"—a remark which drew from Ward a confession of complete ignorance as to what mullions were! During the building of the house at Old Hall, Pugin obtained a fuller insight into his client's architectural deficiencies, and these after a while became so glaring, that he regretted having "designed so respectable a house for him," adding that, if he had his way, Ward should live in a room *opposite Warwick Street Chapel!* Pugin's tastes became at length so sensitive that, on his going on one occasion to visit a friend, he warned his host that he could not eat puddings which were not Gothic in shape! And on Ward writing to acknowledge the authorship of a letter against screens in churches, which he considered undevotional, Pugin replied telling him that he regarded him as "a greater enemy to true Christianity than the most rabid Exeter Hall fanatic." "I knew Pugin was strong in rood screens," remarked Ward; "I did not know he was so good a hand at rude letters."

At Old Hall, living partly on the proceeds of his literary and teaching labours, and partly on the small fortune which his wife brought him, Mr. Ward spent what he afterwards described as far the happiest years of his life, and far happier than any which he anticipated in the future. And here his biographer leaves him, at the end of the earlier volume. As we close the record of this part of his great career, when all his struggles after truth are at an end, when his perplexities and doubts are no more, we seem to feel, what Ward himself must so abundantly have felt, that we are "coming into port after a rough sea."* And that his readers should experience this, is, to our thinking, the greatest compliment which the writer can receive as to the consummate ability with which his labour has been achieved.

For many readers Mr. Wilfrid Ward's later volume, which appeared in the spring of last year, will offer less attraction than did its predecessor. The cause of this is not far to seek. In the first place the progress of a great mind as it gradually approaches the truth, must always be transcendently interesting.

* "Apologia," p. 236.

The books which picture that growth will survive indefinitely the more or less ephemeral controversies which retarded or stimulated it. Which amongst us, for example, would care to follow the ups and downs of the Manichæan controversy? Yet as long as literature exists, as long as mind speaks to mind, the Confessions of St. Augustine will be read, not as the record of a dead and gone polemic, but as the history of the gradual elevation to God's truth of the great luminary of the Western Church.

Who again is there that, for the mere merits of the case, would plod through the countless volumes to which the Oxford Movement gave birth, those bloated bundles of pamphlets, or those more formidable tomes, which "still occupy upper shelves, their backs paler year by year, the dust thickening upon their edges, uncut, practically not worth the cutting."*

And yet who can doubt that, when Protestantism is no more, and when the Church stands, as the sole champion of her Master's divinity, face to face with materialism and infidelity, the record of Newman's mind will live, not merely on account of the matchless English with which it is clothed, but because within its pages, according to its author's pregnant motto: *Cor ad cor loquitur*?

And thus we believe that the earlier of the two volumes which Mr. Wilfrid Ward has given us will, for a similar reason, exceed in interest as the years go on, its admirably written companion. And yet, taken as the history of one to whom the much abused word genius must be applied, as the record of the *Fidei propugnator acerrimus* of his epitaph, of a great Catholic champion, of a man who made no account whatever of intellect, where piety and the spiritual life were in the opposing scale, of one who chose poverty and obscurity because he loved truth better than affluence and success, this volume should, for Catholics at least, hold its place beside its elder brother.

Mr. Ward's Catholic life, so far as his intellectual work is concerned, divides itself naturally into the period of his teaching at St. Edmund's, his writings (especially his writings in

* *The Times*, Sept. 18, 1882.

this REVIEW) on the controversy which culminated at the time of the Vatican Council, and his philosophical and metaphysical polemic against such men as Professor Huxley, John Stuart Mill, and Dr. Alexander Bain. It is when analysing these latter controversies that our author displays the striking clearness of his style. To master such subjects at all is no light task. But to state the various sides to a long and intricate controversy upon abstruse questions of speculative philosophy, and to do so with even-handed justice and temper, and at the same time with such limpid clearness that the whole reads like a simple narrative of facts, is an achievement so considerable that it raises its author far above the average level of English descriptive and analytical biographers.

Turning to another part of this volume, we have heard doubts, and strong doubts, expressed as to whether Mr. Wilfrid Ward was well advised in once more bringing up the domestic controversies of twenty-five years ago. The circumstances which gave rise to them have long since passed away, and though, in a certain sense, their interest remains, at least for the present generation, their ardour and vehemence were the cause of so much pain and so much misunderstanding, that many readers will be sorry to see them revived. Mr. Wilfrid Ward seems to have had this in mind, for he tells us in his Preface* that

in England, as in France, the intense devotedness of the men who took for a time opposite views as to the policy which was most advantageous for the cause of the religious revival, resulted in strong feeling on either side. The time has come when it is necessary to give some account of this, if exaggerated or inaccurate rumours are to be arrested, and the story is to be told before those who knew its circumstances have passed away.

Thinking thus, and to supply in a convenient form some means of studying a past controversy, Mr. Wilfrid Ward was perhaps right in dealing as minutely as he has done with the questions involved. The term "religious (meaning Catholic) revival," however, a little sticks in our throats. Such a term may perhaps be used of post-Revolutionary France; but surely it cannot be applied, except in an extremely limited and modified, and altogether different sense, to England. If

* Pp. x. xi.

Catholics in any country, having fallen into a state of relaxation and apathy, were roused once more to their duties, "revival" would be a fit and proper term to apply to the circumstance. But in England the case was not really parallel to this at all. Catholics at one time were numerically few, but they were not, individually or as a body, relaxed, and, except in the sense that, by the addition of numbers and the growing justice of the Legislature, the Church began to recover from her wounds, the word revival is scarcely an apt term to apply. Besides this, certain forms of dissent have conveyed to the word an odious and sinister meaning, which is as little in accordance with true Catholic piety as is the wild onrush of a savage mob with the steady march of a disciplined army.

Still, if the narrative of bygone controversies had to be given, it could not perhaps have been better done. Some day we may hope for the record of these events from Cardinal Newman's point of view; but while waiting for that, we can point to this volume as a great help towards understanding the position of the great Oratorian in those troubled times. That people in general misunderstood this position is certainly not wonderful. It was necessarily complex in the extreme. Newman himself felt this when he said "a man who has been mixed up with two such different people as Ward and Simpson, cannot explain himself without writing a volume."

But in the space now at our disposal we prefer to revert to the more personal aspects of Ward's character, rather than to follow, in a necessarily meagre manner, the controversies, domestic and external, in which he bore a part.

To gain any full insight into the character of William George Ward our readers must study the volumes before us. To take out from their context illustrations of his unique personality is really to spoil the picture which his son has drawn. But there are certain incidents and anecdotes of his career which well bear quotation; while to those who enjoyed his personal acquaintance, they will recall the charm of the days when he was still amongst us.

As his friends and enemies long ago acknowledged, he was as absolutely free from pedantry and pretence as it is possible for man to be. We have already given an instance of this in the candour with which he avowed his ignorance at the

University Examination. His life abounded with similar examples. Soon after his conversion he found himself in what was almost penury. Suddenly, as he was one day pacing the lawn, a gentleman approached him who offered him £300 a year to undertake the education of his son. In order to teach this new pupil astronomy, he begins himself to learn it. "I am reading two chapters ahead," he says, addressing the pupil. "Ask nothing that comes later." Again, witness the "grotesquely truthful" replies which he made to the questions put to him at an insurance office to which he had applied :

Is your general health good?—It is deplorably bad. Has your family any hereditary complaints?—I should fully expect so. Well, but you look well; I suppose you eat well and sleep well at night.—I have never had a good night in my life. And so on (p. 11).

Then there was an amusing scene between a Priest and himself about a scruple he felt at being unable to wish that the life of an uncle, for whom he did not care in the least, and whose property he was in course of law to inherit, should be prolonged. It was during his uncle's last illness :

It is quite enough [said the Priest] that you should feel a certain regret at the prospect of your uncle's *death*, though you may be pleased to inherit his property. But Mr. Ward's candour was too great to accept this.—I feel no regret whatever at the prospect, he said. Well, you must have a certain wish, quite apart from other consequences, that he might be spared.—No, not the slightest! I never cared for him in the least.—Your poor uncle has been suffering—your spirits fall a little at all events when you hear he is worse?—On the contrary, they rise. Good heavens [said the Priest suddenly], you would not do anything to *hasten* his death, would you?—The roar of laughter with which Ward greeted this question was a sufficient answer to it (*vide* pp. 9, 10).

His health made it essential that he should take riding exercise, and he used to say that, had he not come into money enough to enable him to hire or purchase a horse, he would certainly have died. But his riding was one of his greatest trials. He had the utmost difficulty in sitting a horse at all, and yet his doctor insisted upon at least an hour's riding each day. He could not even rise in the stirrups, and unless the horse was extremely powerful, it ran the risk of breaking its knees. If he mounted a strong horse, he would find to his "profound alarm," that it was beyond his control, and he had

to call to his groom at once, "Take me off, take me off." Asked if he did not become fond of his horses, "Fond of my horses?" he replied, "you might as well ask if I were fond of my pills." And no wonder, seeing that it was no very uncommon event for him to be thrown, though he never received any injury. The only mitigation of the trial of having to ride

lay in the intense amusement he found in the incongruity of the whole performance and the picture of himself rising at the appointed hour, leaving his scholastic folio for the riding school in fear and trembling, placing himself, with a profound sense of his own incompetence, unreservedly in the hands of his groom, to do what he would with him, was one which tickled his imagination.—"W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival," pp. 79, 80.

Dean Goulburn supplies a most humorous description of one of these daily exercises, which is unfortunately too long to quote. In the intervals, while a fresh horse was being prepared, the Dean relates how Ward would approach him, rubbing his hands and saying, "Now then, Goulburn, I'm quite ready to begin that argument again where we left it off."

Whether as an addition to horse exercise or instead of it, Ward designed a kind of chair, which, by a mechanical contrivance, produced a motion similar to that of a trotting horse. His friend, Henry Wilberforce, who to the end of his life could never without extreme difficulty decipher Ward's calligraphy (the "walking-sticks gone mad" of Lord Tennyson), used jokingly to maintain that he conducted his correspondence while being jerked up and down in the chair. So essential to his health was this exercise, that a special chair was built on one occasion when Ward had to leave home to vote against Sir John Simeon's candidature, so that he might not lose the exercise even for a day.

But any account of Ward would be incomplete indeed which did not say something of his passion for music. It was probably his greatest earthly pleasure. He was as a rule a bad sleeper. Writing to Mrs. Ward to report a good night, which he enjoyed soon after the appointment of Manning to the See of Westminster, he says: "A good sleep at night and a good Archbishop by day (and a good opera in the evening) are adequate for human felicity" (p. 223).

Years before, when at Oxford, he had been advised by Pusey to abstain from music during Lent, as his health forbade him to fast. Three weeks were passed without his great solace when, one day meeting Coffin in High Street, Ward complained to him of intense depression, which made him feel as if he were going out of his mind. Could not a little music be allowed? After a discussion, it was agreed that strictly sacred music would be no harm.

Beginning with Cherubini's "O Salutaris" they gradually passed to "Possenti Numi" in the "Flauto Magico." But this opened a book containing songs somewhat lighter, and the duet between Papageno and Papagena followed. The music waxed faster and livelier till it culminated in "Largo al Factotum," the lightest and raciest of buffo songs, in the middle of which one of the company suddenly recollected that the room in Christ Church in which he was singing was separated only by a thin wall from Dr. Pusey's own rooms.—"W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement," pp. 40, 41.

And how well those who knew him can sympathise with his sufferings when, between the acts of the "Barbiere," the then editor of the *Tablet*, Mr. Wallis, told him the result of one of his controversies in Rome, the news of which had just reached London, and when, on the same evening, he was introduced to a partisan of Döllinger! In his biographer's words:

Ward, imagining himself in the streets of Seville, gossiping with Figaro, laughing at Bartolo, drinking in the music from the voices of Almaviva and Rosina, forgetting that there was such a thing as a Liberal Catholic party and an approaching Council, was roughly awakened to the realities and the pains of life. The opera was spoilt, the illusion could not be restored . . . and he rose with a heavy heart and left before the second act was half over. With an assumption of humour, but with very real feeling, he said when he next met the editor of the *Tablet*; "If you ever meet me at the opera again, I have two requests to make: 1st. That you will not talk about theology; 2nd. That you will not introduce me to Döllingerites.—"W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival," p. 233.

And now, with painful consciousness of how little I have done justice to these most delightful and admirably written volumes, I bring this notice of them to a close. I am conscious that I have not given any real account at all of the years which Ward spent as a Catholic, of his labours for the Church he loved so dearly, of his championship of true philosophy against the various discordant speculations of infidel

writers, or of the work which he regarded as the greatest of his life, of instructing the divines in theology, at St. Edmund's. Still less have I left myself space to speak of that hidden life of piety and recollection of God's presence, which formed so important a feature in his character. As for this last point, let us turn to the account of his death-bed, written, not in these volumes, but in a sympathetic memoir which appeared a few years ago. A man on his death-bed speaks truth; and Ward, as we have seen, was transparently truthful all his life through. And this is what he said: "God knows that, with all my faults, I have had no stronger desire than that of loving Him and promoting His glory." And his last words were: "I wish to go to my Saviour." And this he did on Thursday, July 6, 1882.* We can well imagine that the writing of these volumes was a labour of love to their author. He is rightly proud of such a father, and we like to think how, if he were still amongst us, the father would be proud, and justly proud, of his son!

WILFRID WILBERFORCE.

* *Vide Merry England* for May 1885, p. 9.

ART. II.—TEXTUAL CRITICISM AND THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

1. *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis*. Edited, with an Introduction, &c., by FREDERICK H. SCRIVENER, M.A., &c. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co. 1864.
2. *Codex Laudianus sive Actus Apostolorum Græce et Latine ex Codice olim Laudiano nunc Bodleiano*. Edidit A. F. CONSTANTINUS DE TISCHENDORF. Leipsic: Hinrichs. 1870.
3. *Codex Bezae: a Study of the so-called Western Text of the New Testament*. By J. RENDEL HARRIS. Cambridge: University Press. 1891.
4. *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170*. By W. M. RAMSAY, M.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1893.
5. *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae*. By FREDERICK HENRY CHASE, B.D. London: Macmillan. 1893.
6. *Ein alte Recension der Apostelgeschichte*. Von Dr. C. BLASS. In *Studien u. Kritiken*, January 1894. Berlin: Perthes.

NOT less emphatic than the Holy Father's condemnation, in his late Encyclical, of the "inept method" of the *soi-disant* "Higher Criticism," is his encouragement of critical investigations conducted on sound principles with the object of fixing and determining as accurately as possible the true text of the Sacred Books. And not the least important part of these investigations is concerned with the endeavour to trace, as far as may be possible, the history of the transmission of the text both in its original languages and in its more important versions. Within the last few years the Book of the Acts of the Apostles has in a very special manner engaged the attention of those scholars who have made the subject of textual criticism their own; and in particular four of the distinguished writers, whose names stand at the head of this article, have recently published the results of a close study of that peculiar recension

of the Acts which is exhibited by a famous Cambridge MS., called—after the name of its donor—the *Codex Beza*. I hope to do some slight service to those biblical students, who may not have access to the works in question, by giving a brief account of their main drift, and I will venture, with that reserve which befits my own more limited acquaintance with the subject, to record a provisional judgment on the chief points at issue. Dr. Scrivener's monumental edition of the *Codex Beza*, and Tischendorf's still more sumptuous facsimile of the *Codex Laudianus Actuum* (of which more anon), are the foundations on which all subsequent scholars have built. I have therefore placed their titles at the head of the list of works, of which we are here to take account. But our chief concern will be with the hypotheses put forward with reference to the Bezan text by Mr. Rendel Harris, Professor Ramsay, Mr. Chase, and Dr. Blass respectively.

It may, perhaps, be not superfluous to mention that the *Codex Beza* is a sixth-century Græco-Latin MS. of the Gospels and the Acts hailing probably from Southern Gaul.* The Greek and Latin texts are arranged in parallel columns, and the text is broken up into short lines of somewhat unequal length, the end of each line usually corresponding to some slight pause in the sense. For the most part the words are written continuously, *i.e.*, without a break between word and word, but the spaces and points occurring here and there both in the Greek and in the Latin texts, taken together with other indications which need not here be specified, indicate that the Codex is a copy of an older MS. in which a similar yet not identical "colometry" was observed, the lines in the older MS. having been in many cases shorter than in the actual *Codex Beza*. Confining our attention for the present to the Bezan text of the Acts, it is to be observed that the most striking features of that text is the presence of a very large number of interpolations or glosses, or rather of what must be regarded as such on the hypothesis that the current text is really entitled to be regarded as representing the original

* The MS. originally contained, between the Gospels and the Acts, the Catholic Epistles. Of these, however, only one small fragment has been preserved. There are also considerable *lacunæ* in the Gospels and Acts. That *Codex Beza* was in Southern Gaul for many centuries is matter of history. That it was actually written there is highly probable, but not quite certain.

form of the Acts.* Of such glosses Scrivener reckons more than 600, and of these Mr. Harris has selected 190, which he exhibits in a most helpful table, occupying nearly seven pages (pp. 215-221) of his monograph on the Bezan MS. Similar lists form the nucleus, or rather the backbone, of Dr. Blass's paper and of Mr. Chase's volume. That of Dr. Blass is by far the most elaborate in its record of collateral attestations with their several divergences, but Mr. Harris's list has the great merit of striking the eye and of being easily comprehended at a glance.

Obviously I can here give no more than a selection from Mr. Harris's 190 "selected glosses," but in order to convey anything like an adequate notion of the character of the Bezan text it will be necessary to set before the reader a considerable number of examples. Our first set of instances shall be taken from what Mr. Harris describes as "a group of bold and startling expansions of the narratives, the major part of which certainly proceeded from a common hand" (p. 223). For the reader's convenience I will give the texts in English, marking by italics the words and phrases which the *Codex Bezae* adds to the current text.

ii. 41. This man *gazing with his eyes and seeing* Peter and John about to go into the temple, asked them for an alms.

iii. 11. And as Peter and John went out *he went with them, holding them fast, but they (i.e., the people) wondering stood in the porch that is called Solomon's, greatly astonished.*

iv. 18. *But they all having taken counsel together, &c.*

iv. 32. *And there was no dissension among them.*

v. 15. *And they were set free from every infirmity which each of them had.*

v. 22. But the servants when they came *and opened the prison* found them not within.

v. 38, 39. Refrain from these men and let them alone, *soiling not your hands, for if this counsel or this work be of men it will be overthrown, but if it is of God, ye will not be able to overthrow them, neither you nor kings nor princes; refrain ye therefore from these men.*

vi. 15. Like the face of an angel *standing in the midst of them.*

vii. 21. And when he (Moses) was cast out *by the river.*

vii. 24. Smiting the Egyptian *and hiding him in the sand.*

viii. 1. Except the Apostles *who remained in Jerusalem.*

* For the purposes of this article the minor differences between the "received text," strictly so called, and the modern recensions of (*e.g.*) Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, or Weiss (Leipzig, 1893), may be left out of account.

viii. 24. *And he ceased not to weep much.*

x. 25. *And when Peter drew nigh to Cæsarea, one of his servants going before announced that he had come, and Cornelius leaping up and going to meet him, fell at his feet. (T. R. And when it came to pass that Peter entered, &c.).*

xi. 2. *Now Peter of a long time was desirous to go to Jerusalem, and calling the brethren he comforted them, holding much discourse through the land, teaching them that came to meet him, and announcing to them the grace of God. (T. R. And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, &c.).*

xi. 27. *There came down prophets from Jerusalem to Antioch, and there was great rejoicing. And when we were gathered together, &c.*

xii. 10. *Et cum exissent descenderunt septem gradus et processerunt gradum (T. R. vicum) unum.*

xii. 20. *Now he was highly displeased with them of Tyre and Sidon; and they came with one accord from both cities to the king.*

xii. 21, 22. *And upon a set day Herod arrayed himself in royal apparel, and sat on the judgment-seat, and made an oration to the people; and whereas he forgave the Syrians, the people cried out (saying): The voice of a god, &c.*

xii. 23. *And when he came down from the judgment-seat he was eaten of worms while yet living, and even thus gave up the ghost.*

xiv. 7. *they preached the Gospel. And all the multitude was moved at their teaching. But Paul and Barnabas tarried at Lystra.*

xvi. 35. *But when it was day the magistrates gathered together in the forum, and remembering the earthquake which had taken place they sent the serjeants saying, &c.*

Not less important in their way than these “graphic expansions,” are a whole class of glosses which appear to have a doctrinal tendency. Not that they set forth any new or strange dogmas, but they bring into stronger relief certain closely-related truths. Thus many of them by special emphasis on the Person and work of the Holy Spirit, on the power of the Holy Name, on *παρρησία* or freedom of speech in the cause of God, on the distinction between believers and non-believers, on the necessity of faith, especially in connection with baptism, on the preaching of the Gospel and the Word or the Person of Christ (Harris, pp. 221, 222). The following are some instances, the intended words and phrases being as before indicated by italics.

iv. 24. *And they hearing it and recognising the power of God, &c.*

vi. 10. *And they were not able to withstand the wisdom which was in him and the Holy Spirit by which he spake, for as much as they were convicted by him (or Him) in all freedom of speech, &c.*

[No. 11 of Fourth Series.]

C

xi. 17. Who was I that I could withstand God, *that He should not give them the Holy Spirit, seeing they believed in Him.*

xv. 32. Judas and Silas being themselves also prophets, *full of the Holy Spirit.*

xix. 1. *And whereas Paul desired according to his own counsel to go to Jerusalem, the Spirit said to him that he should return to Asia, and having passed through the upper country he came to Ephesus. (The Bezan reading has displaced the words "And it came to pass that while Apollos was at Corinth.")*

xviii. 4. *Et interponens nomen Domini nostri Jesu Christi.*

xviii. 8. *Per nomen Domini nostri, &c.*

xvi. 4. *And as they went on their way through the cities they preached and delivered to them with all freedom of speech our Lord Jesus Christ, at the same time delivering to them the decrees, &c.*

iv. 31. *And they spake the word of God with boldness, &c., omni volenti credere.*

xvii. 12. *Many of them therefore believed, but some would not believe.*

xv. 38. *But Paul would not, and said to those who had withdrawn from them from Pamphylia and who went not to the work whereto they were sent, that such an one should not be with them. (T. R. But Paul thought not good to take with them those who, &c.).*

xv. 20. *And that what they would not should be done to themselves, to others do ye not. (Added to the decrees of the Council of Jerusalem. The grammatical anacoluthon is in the Greek and Latin text. A similar addition, together with the words *φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι*, is found in xv. 29).*

The reader has now before him sufficient materials from which to form a good general idea of the character of the Bezan text with its "glosses" or "interpolations." But *are* they glosses or interpolations? Or does *Codex Bezae* perchance represent, as Bornemann thought, the primitive text of the Acts, of which the current text is only an imperfect and mutilated transcript? Bornemann indeed has had, so far as we are aware, not a single follower among textual critics; but now Dr. Blass comes forward with a hypothesis more startling even than Bornemann's; so startling indeed, and of such interest, that though latest in time we must needs discuss it before passing on to the consideration of the views put forward by Harris, Ramsay, and Chase. He suggests that the Bezan text and the *receptus* represent nothing less than two successive editions of the Acts put forth by St. Luke himself! Or, to speak more precisely, that the longer text represents the inspired writer's *first draft* of his work, while the shorter reproduces, with more or less exact fidelity, the fair copy which

St. Luke sent to Theophilus. It is so refreshing to find a really learned author taking for granted, in these days of "advanced" criticism, that St. Luke was the author of the Acts, that one is inclined—in consideration of this fundamental orthodoxy—to allow such a writer a little license in the matter of subsidiary hypotheses. Needless to say, however, Dr. Blass claims no such license; and his hypothesis must be examined on its merits. The grounds on which it rests appear to be these.

1. The Bezan glosses do not stand alone. A very large proportion of them are found in the *Codex Laudianus*, another Græco-Latin MS., dating, like *Codex Beza*, from the sixth century.* Again, a very considerable number of them, as well as others of a similar character which do not occur in *Codex Beza*, are met with either in the margin or—enclosed between an asterisk and a metobelus—in the text of the Philoxenian Syriac.† Many, too, are attested by the somewhat scanty and fragmentary remains of the old Latin version which has been preserved in various ancient documents, and especially in the early Gallican and Mozarabic lectionaries and in quotations from the Acts in the Latin Fathers (Blass, p. 90). Now this variety of attestation, with its wide geographical diffusion, implies that at an early date the Bezan text must have enjoyed a very high degree of authority. Here is a fact which needs to be accounted for; and though it does not of course amount, nor does Blass pretend that it amounts, to a proof of his theory, it must at least be admitted that the Blassian hypothesis does at first sight supply a plausible explanation of the fact. And the wide currency of the Bezan "glosses" at least requires us to hesitate before we ascribe them to the vagaries of a single unknown scribe or copyist.

2. The Bezan "glosses" are, he thinks, of such a character that no unauthorised person would have thought it worth his

* The *Cod. Laud.* contains, at the end of *Acts*, the opening words of a decree issued by one Flavius (?) Pancratius, who is described as an "Eparch" and governor (δουξ) of Sardinia. The original home of the MS. is thus indicated, and the title of "Eparch" fixes its date as falling between A.D. 534 and 731. On palæographical grounds it is assigned to the sixth century. As Ven. Bede made use of it in his later, but not in his earlier works, it was probably brought to England in his lifetime, perhaps by St. Bennet Biscop.

† These glosses in the Philoxenian were derived either from a Syriac MS. (which is highly improbable), or, as a scribe's note *ad calcem* seems to imply, from a Greek MS. preserved at Alexandria. In either case the attestation is Eastern.

while to insert them. While making the narrative more graphic, and rendering the writer's thought more implicit, they make no substantial addition to what we learn from the current text. On the other hand they are, both in material truth and in other respects, too considerable to have been omitted by the carelessness of copyists (Blass, p. 88). But the facts of the case are, he thinks, satisfactorily accounted for if we suppose the original writer of Acts, *i.e.*, St. Luke himself, after writing a first draft of the text, to have afterwards re-written it omitting a number of phrases not necessary to the integrity of the record. That an author in revising his own work should freely excise and condense is obviously no matter for surprise (p. 89). That a mere copyist should have taken such liberties is to say the least by no means in harmony with what we know of the textual history of the books, of the New Testament.

3. But is there any special reason for supposing that St. Luke did in fact write two copies of the Acts? Dr. Blass replies in the affirmative. The writings of St. Luke are distinguished from the other Books of the New Testament by the fact that they were addressed to a person of high rank, the Theophilus of St. Luke i. 3; Acts i. 1. Now a book destined for such a person would be neatly written on choice parchment, and the fair copy would almost certainly be preceded by a rough copy which—under these circumstances—the writer would keep; and which after his death would be preserved and highly prized in the Church. But if once it be admitted that St. Luke wrote two copies of his work, the experience of every one will suggest the probability that the second copy would be distinguished from the first by greater conciseness (*ibid.*).

Such are the heads of Dr. Blass's general argument, which he supplements by notes on individual passages, in which it seems to him beyond question that the longer text is the original from which the shorter has been derived, and not *vice versa*.

It is a little difficult to give specimens of Dr. Blass's method of reasoning on particular passages. At one time he appeals to the literary instinct of the reader, calling on him to recognise that the shorter text is derived from the longer, and

not *vice versâ*; or he points out how the Bezan reading, either by supplying a motive or in some other way, clears up the obscurity which here and there besets the shorter text (*e.g.*, xi. 20-22, xx. 3-6); or he calls attention to the fact, which no one denies, that this or that bit of local colouring makes the narrative more graphic (*e.g.*, iii. 11); or lastly he declares that such or such a supposed gloss is altogether superfluous ("recht müssig," *e.g.*, v. 18), and that for that very reason it is not to be thought that anyone would have arbitrarily inserted it ("Aber eben deshalb einem Interpolator nicht zuzutrauen," p. 114). But the real strength of his position lies in the general considerations already set forth.

It is no doubt a tempting hypothesis, and one to which I would willingly subscribe, if only I could satisfy myself that Dr. Blass's grounds were—I will not say convincing—but at least strong enough to support a probable conclusion.* But before they can be so regarded, it would seem that other possible hypotheses concerning the source of the Bezan expansions must be concluded. As long as they are in the field the utmost that can be said for Dr. Blass's theory is that it provides a possible explanation, not that it is positively probable. To these rival hypotheses we will turn our attention presently; but in the meantime I must point out that there are, as it seems to me, some strong positive reasons which militate against Dr. Blass's view. In the first place, while fully recognising the variety and the weight of the collateral attestations in favour of the Bezan additions to the current text, the very considerable variety in the form which these additions take, not merely in patristic quotations, but in textual documents so nearly allied as *Codex Beza* and the *Codex Laudianus*, appears to me to be fatal to their ultimate derivation from so authentic a source as a Greek autograph of St. Luke himself. Under the same head of argument may be brought the singularly ungrammatical construction of not a few of the "glosses." On Dr. Blass's own pages the reader continually reads the words "kontamination," "korrupirt," &c. Why should there be so much "contamination" and "corrup-

* It is hardly necessary to point out that the hypothesis of a double recension of *Acts* in no way militates against the Catholic doctrine of Inspiration. Compare the second (or first) recension of Ps. xviii. in 2 Sam. xxii.

tion" of an authentic text?*. Secondly, as regards some at least of the additions, the tell-tale repetition of the same phrase before and after them proclaims them to be interpolations thrust into the true text. Two notable examples of this occur within a short distance of one another—viz., in v. 39, when the words "refrain ye therefore from these men," which has already occurred in verse 38, is *repeated after the gloss* "neither ye nor kings nor princes;" and vi. 10, where the phrase "being unable to resist the truth" is a mere repetition (with the change of one word) of the genuine phrase "being unable to resist the wisdom," &c., which had occurred just before a little series of intruded phrases. Now such is the family likeness which connects the whole series of the Bezan glosses, that to demonstrate the intrusive nature of even two of them is to throw doubt on the genuineness of the rest. Moreover, Dr. Blass is, we think, hardly on safe ground when he says (p. 89) that the glosses are of such a character that no one would have thought of inserting them. It is not easy to be sure as to what a person, to us entirely unknown, would or would not have thought of doing; but this at least may be said, that if it is possible to indicate a possible external source, or more than one such source, whence the glosses may probably have been derived, something will have been done towards suggesting a motive for interpolating them. Now such a source can in many cases be assigned with something like certainty. Several of the glosses are mere verbal repetitions of phrases occurring elsewhere in Acts; *e.g.*, the phrase "it is hard for thee to kick against the goad" (ix. 4, 5, taken bodily from xxvi. 14). Others fill up the sentence with a detail borrowed from the Old Testament, as when we read that Moses was "cast forth by the river," and that after he had slain the Egyptian he "hid him in the sand" (Acts vii. 21, 24; *cf.* Exod. ii. 3, 12). Nor can we be at a loss to understand the motive which probably led to the insertion of the "graphic expansions" and "doctrinal" glosses of which mention has already been made, or to the re-casting of the text in cases where the relation of cause and effect might seem to a bold reviser to be somewhat obscure (*e.g.*, x. 25, xii. 20, 21; quoted above).

* On the ungrammatical structure of the Bezan glosses Mr. Chase has a strong passage, which we shall have occasion to quote later.

But let us turn in the next place to Professor Ramsay, and see what light he has to throw on the subject. He deals, indeed, with only a small number of the Bezan readings, but his treatment of these is full of interest. Those of them which add details concerning scenes in the cities of Asia Minor are, he thinks, so graphic and true to nature that sometimes they "almost incline us to think that *Codex Bezae* gives us . . . the original text" (p. 151). Yet this, in view of other considerations, can, he thinks, hardly be the case.

In xix. 9, the addition ἀπὸ ὥρας ἑῶς δεκάτης ("from the fifth hour to the tenth") can hardly be explained, except as a deliberate impertinence (which is improbable) or as founded on an actual tradition, which was believed by the reviser to have survived in Ephesus from the time of St. Paul's residence there. It is quite probable that this tradition is true. The school would be open for Paul's use after the scholars were dismissed. Now schools opened at daybreak both in Greece and in Rome. . . . It is, therefore, not strange that school should be over one hour before midday (*i.e.*, at the fifth hour, p. 152).

In xx. 4, *Codex Bezae* reads Ἐφέσιοι for Ἀσιανοί. . . . The desire to give due honour to Ephesus in this case would favour the idea that the reviser belonged to, or was closely connected with, that city. But . . . it does not appear safe to infer more than that the reviser was intimately connected with the whole group of churches . . . that lay along the road [from Ephesus] towards South Galatia and Syria . . . and jealous of their honour (p. 154).

Dr. Blass, who in his article takes no account of Professor Ramsay's chapter on the Bezan text, would urge, no doubt, that this truthfulness to nature need not be explained by ascribing the glosses to a diligent collector of local traditions, but that it falls in excellently with his own theory that St. Luke was himself the author of the unabridged (not "expanded") text, and that what more than one of the glosses "almost incline us to think," is in fact precisely what we ought to believe. But Professor Ramsay claims further to have made it clear that on European soil the supposed "reviser" is by no means at home, but blunders rather badly in his efforts to improve the text. Thus:

In xvi. 12, according to the received text, Philippi is the "first (*i.e.*, leading) city of its division of Macedonia, a colonia;" but in *Codex Bezae* it is "the head of Macedonia, a city, a colonia." The latter description is not expressed in the proper terms, does not cohere well together, and is actually incorrect . . . Philippi was merely first in one of the districts

into which Macedonia was divided, but not in the whole province. . . . The reviser, unfamiliar with the constitution of the province, understood *Μακεδονίας* as genitive in apposition with *μερίδος*, whereas it is really partitive genitive depending on it: [and being dissatisfied with *μερίδος* as a name for a whole province thought to express the meaning better by omitting it. Moreover] for "first" he substituted the term "head," which is less technically accurate. . . . The reason [of the change] lay in the ambiguity of the phrase. . . . In order to prevent readers from taking the phrase in the sense of "the city nearest in its district, and which they first reached," the reviser altered the expression, and substituted an unmistakable phrase for a doubtful one. In all probability the person who made this change was aware that the interpretation of which he disapproved was advocated by some, and desired to eliminate the possibility of mistake. Whether he was right in his view is even at the present day a matter of controversy; *but his attitude towards the passage is clear, and his change is instructive as regards the principles on which he treated the text of Acts* (pp. 156, 157).

As regards other expansions "in the European part of the narrative," Mr. Ramsay points out that, unlike the Asiatic glosses, they really add nothing to the story, but are either mere inferences from the briefer statements of the received text, or are concerned with "the character of Paul's preaching (xviii. 4), or the intervention of supernatural guidance in his course" (xvii. 5). Obviously, however, cases such as these would afford no ground of argument against Blass's hypothesis, for St. Luke himself might well omit expressions which only told what the reader could infer for himself, or which told anew what had been sufficiently indicated elsewhere. But it is otherwise with instances in which the Bezan text involves a positive error, as seems to be the case in the passage concerning Philippi, and in xvii. 15 ("and he passed by Thessaly, for he was prevented from preaching the word to them") where, as Mr. Ramsay points out, the reviser seems to have mistaken a sea-voyage for a journey by land (p. 160). If *one* such instance of an error of fact in the Bezan glosses can be established, this should be sufficient to throw suspicion upon the whole body of them, and to bring them down from the high position assigned to them by Blass to the humble condition of unauthorised interpolations.

I cannot here dwell on the reasons which have led Mr. Ramsay to assert that the Bezan text of *Acts* is "founded on a Catholic recension" (p. 161), certain features in the narrative

which are "characteristic of the social system of Asia Minor," but which were distasteful to the Church at large, having been eliminated (*e.g.*, "the prominence of women," xvii. 12, 34). But we must find space for a portion of the passage in which he sums up his conclusions.

The freedom with which the reviser treated the text proves that he was a person of some position and authority. The care that he took to suit the text to the facts of the day proves that he desired to make it intelligible to the public. The knowledge that he shows of the topography and the facts of Asia and of South Galatia proves that he was intimately acquainted with the churches from Ephesus on the West to Iconium and Lystra on the East; and the felicity with which he treats the text, in all that relates to Asia, seems to be due to his perfect familiarity with the country, for it deserts him when he tries to apply the same treatment to the European narrative (p. 163).

Then follows an argument to prove from the reviser's use of certain politico-geographical terms, that "he belonged to the second century," and in particular that "his knowledge was gained before Lycaonia was disjoined from Galatia between 138 and 161 A.D." "The revision, he concludes, "can hardly be dated later than A.D. 150-160" (p. 164).

Quite at variance with Professor Ramsay is Mr. Rendel Harris. His leading thesis is that the origin of the Bezan glosses is to be sought *not in the Greek text of that MS., but in the Latin version.* His general grounds for this hypothesis are these.

1. The collateral attestation of the glosses is Latin rather than Greek. Many of them are supported, as has been seen, by the bilingual *Codex Laudianus*, by MSS. embodying fragments of the old Latin Version, and by quotations in the Latin Fathers who used that version. On the other hand, the only Greek Father who lends them any support is St. Irenæus; and he, from his long residence at Lyons, deserves to be regarded as belonging to the Western rather than to the Eastern Church.

2. Many of the glosses betray, he holds, a distinctively Montanist tendency, those namely which have been classed above as of a "doctrinal" character. Now the home of Montanism was not the East but the West, and a Montanist reviser might be expected to tamper rather with the Latin than with the Greek text of the Acts.

3. These considerations, however, and especially the latter

of them, could not be trusted of themselves, were it not that a careful examination of a number of individual passages points, in Mr. Harris's opinion, to the priority of the Latin text. And, indeed, the writer of this article must himself acknowledge that he has elsewhere strongly maintained the powerful reflex action of the Bezan Latin on its companion Greek text at least within the limits of the Gospels.*

But whatever may be the case as regards the Gospels, I cannot go with Mr. Harris in assigning a Latin origin to the intrusive glosses of the Bezan Acts. In reply to Mr. Harris's first argument, it is to be observed that, if regard be had to the Philoxenian Syriac, the Eastern attestation is hardly, if at all, not less strong, and, indeed, at first sight, much stronger than the Western. Hence, before an argument can safely be built upon the Latin attestation, it is necessary that the nature of the relation between the Eastern and Western documents which attest the glosses, also—we may add—between the old Syriac and old Latin versions of the New Testament, should be first determined. Secondly, while I fully admit that the “doctrinal” glosses of *Codex Bezae* unquestionably witness to the operation of those tendencies which ultimately issued in the suggestions and excesses of Montanism, there are, I think, no sure grounds on which a specifically Montanist character can be claimed for them. Hence an attempt to fix the date of the glosses by an inquiry as to the date of the *maximum* record of the Montanist thermometer in Rome (Harris, p. 214) is, I think—and I hope Mr. Harris will forgive me for saying so—somewhat beside the mark. Lastly, when we come to look into the particular instances brought forward by Mr. Harris to prove the Latin origin of the glosses, we find that several of them (*e.g.*, i. 4, 5 ; ix. 20 ; xv. 29 ; xvi. 4) are simply cases of Latin attestation or of “Montanism,” which need not be here further dealt with, while comparatively few rest on such distinctively grammatical or idiomatic grounds as seem to Mr. Harris to imply “latinisation.” Of these we will discuss one or two presently ; but we must first state the case for the hypothesis proposed by Mr. Chase.

Mr. Chase has a theory concerning the Bezan glosses

* In the *Tablet*, June 10th and 17th, 1893.

which is all his own. The old Syriac version of the Acts—did we but possess it—would, he thinks, be found to supply the key to the problem. *Did we but possess it.* In these five words lies the gist of all the objections which we have seen raised against Mr. Chase's theory in such reviews of his book as we have come across. The old Syriac version of the Acts has, so far as is known, perished beyond recovery; though in these days of enterprising exploration and fortunate finds there is no knowing what surprises may be in store for us. Under present circumstances, however, Mr. Chase is fully conscious that his position is "open to the obvious criticism, 'You are judging the Bezan text by a standard which you evolve out of the Bezan text itself. You are arguing in a vicious circle'" (p. ix.). And, indeed, beyond this somewhat elementary criticism, some at least of Mr. Chase's critics do not seem to have gone.

But Mr. Chase has his answer ready. Given a series of interpolations, glosses, expansions, call them what you will, which are common in substance to two documents so closely related as *Codex Bezae* and *Codex Laudianus*, but which constantly exhibit a greater or less degree of verbal divergence, we are led to look for the source of these glosses in a document *written in some other language*, to which both Codices are either mediately or immediately indebted at least for these additions to the current text. If it be found, moreover, that a considerable proportion of the glosses show traces of a Syriac idiom or of Syriac usage, there is obviously a presumption that the language from which the verbally divergent glosses are derived is Syriac. If, thirdly, it is found that the actual Syriac Vulgate (the Peshitto) still retains traces of expressions which might well have given birth to some at least of the Bezan and Laudian readings, the case for an old Syriac source is materially strengthened. Now it is precisely on these grounds that Mr. Chase has based his theory.*

A fourth argument which seems to tell in favour of Mr. Chase's view must also be here set forth. I have already

* "My safe emergence, as I hope, from these labyrinths [of conjecture, &c.] I owe to three clues" (chap. x.). We have endeavoured to state, somewhat more plainly and explicitly than Mr. Chase has done, the nature of these "three clues."

expressed the opinion that Dr. Blass has been somewhat hasty in assuming (p. 88) that harmonisation, or a process analogous thereto, has played no part in the building up of the Bezan text. Mr. Chase, on the contrary, shows—satisfactorily as I think—that “assimilation” and borrowing have been potent factors in the case. In many cases, besides the one or two which have been already specified, the Bezan glosses appear to be nothing but more or less appropriate “tags” imported either from other places in the Acts, or from the Gospels, or in some cases perhaps from the Old Testament. Yet it is clear that in several instances they have not been derived from the *Greek* text of the passages in question, whereas there are grounds for thinking that they do reflect the Syriac version of these passages. Moreover, it is hardly open to question that the tendency to eke out the canonical text by sentences thus imported was characteristic of the Syriac Church. The Diatessaron of Tatian is a palmary instance of this tendency working itself out on a large scale, and the importance and influence of the Diatessaron in Syria in the second and third century it would be difficult to over-estimate. A similar tendency is manifest in the apocryphal “Gospel of Peter,” as no one has more conclusively shown than Mr. Harris himself;* and this piece of pseudo-Apostolic patchwork almost certainly came into existence either in Syria or on its very borders. So, too, the patchwork “Epistle to the Laodiceans,” which is first mentioned by that “Nestorian before Nestorius,” Theodore of Mopsuestia, probably had its birthplace not very far from Antioch.

I was at first not a little surprised that Mr. Chase had not laid more stress than he has done on yet another consideration which at first sight seemed likely to turn out more important even than those which he has put forward. I refer to the presence of so large a proportion of the Bezan glosses in the margin, or (marked by an asterisk) in the text of the Philoxenian Syriac. It might be thought that in any argument which seeks to establish the Syriac origin of these interpolations, their actual presence in an extant Syriac text ought to have been regarded as of primary importance. Unfortunately, however, there seems to be little room for

* In the *Contemporary Review*, Aug. 1893.

doubt that, as is commonly supposed, the Philoxenian glosses as they stand have not been taken directly from an ancient Syriac MS., but have been translated from the Greek. The grounds for this conclusion will be found at the foot of the page, and the conclusion itself entirely disposes of the claim of the Philoxenian to be regarded as a primary authority for the determination of the question at issue between Mr. Chase and Mr. Harris.* At the same time I think Mr. Chase would have done well to quote the Philoxenian, at least by way of illustration, more frequently than he has done. In such cases as may afford the opportunity I will supply the omission.

I will now bring forward some instances from among those selected by Mr. Chase himself (p. x.), as especially suitable for the establishment of a *prima facie* case for his hypothesis. But while on the one hand I must content myself with giving in each case the briefest possible summary of Mr. Chase's argument, I shall on the other hand venture to supplement, in one particular, what he has written. With a delicacy of feeling which every one must respect he has refrained as far as possible, throughout his volume, from direct criticism of Mr. Harris's opinion (p. viii). The position which he takes up in relation to that opinion may be summarised in a single sentence occurring at the outset of his volume. "To prove that the Bezan Greek text is moulded on a Syriac text is to disprove the theory of its Latinisation" (p. 2). Now I have no wish to show less respect and friendliness than Mr. Chase has shown towards Mr. Harris, to

* It is with some reluctance, and only after a careful examination of the Philoxenian glosses, that I have come to this conclusion. The grounds of it are these: (1) Thomas of Harkel, the reviser of the Philoxenian version, in a note which he appends to the "Book of the Apostolic Acts and of the Seven Catholic Epistles," speaks of having diligently collated the text, not with other Syriac MSS., but with "a very accurate Greek MS. of . . . Alexandria." (2) The asterisks and metobeli are found also in the Euthalian *capitula* which he prefixes to the Pauline Epistles. These *capitula* were certainly translated from the Greek, and, by the nature of the case, could not have been contained in an old Syriac version (White, *Pref.*, p. ix.). (3) The possessive pronoun *dileh* is common in the Philoxenian glosses (Acts xii. 3 mg.), but not in the Curetonian. Again, *παρρησια* is simply transliterated in the Philoxenian gloss at vi. 10, just as in the text at ii. 29, &c. The Curetonian, like the Peshitto, renders *παρρησια* by the phrase *'in bagle*. Other instances equally fatal to the claims of these glosses to represent an old Syriac text could no doubt be easily found. j

whom I am indebted for much instruction and for more personal kindness than can fittingly be acknowledged here. But I think that the cause of truth will be served if, besides endeavouring to show that Mr. Chase's Syriac key *does* fit this or that ward of the Bezan lock, I also take occasion to point out how and why the Latin key constructed by Mr. Harris occasionally sticks obstinately fast.* But it is time, as the ascetical writers are fond of saying, to "descend to particulars." †

ii. 17: D. substitutes αὐτῶν for ὑμῶν (twice). The change is not easily explained if it originated in Greek or in Latin, but the similarity of the forms *b'nai kun* and *b'nai hun* in Syriac is obvious.

ii. 47: D. substitutes κόσμον for λαόν, d. *mundum* for *populum*, a change easily accounted for by the similarity (in writing more than in sound) of the Syriac 'amo (λαόν) and 'olmo (κόσμον).

iii. 13: D. interpolates εἰς κρίσω, E. εἰς κριτήριον, d.e. *in iudicium*. The two Greek words might be, as Mr. Harris suggests, independent renderings of the common Latin.‡ But it is noteworthy that the insertion, while not characteristically Latin, is characteristically Syriac, as appears from Lev. xxiv. 20, where both Syr. cur. and Syr. vg. insert *l'dino* (εἰς κρίσω) between παρέδωκαν and θάνατον(ον). (Chase omits to mention that Syr. phil. mg. has *l'dino* here).

iv. 32: D. adds καὶ οὐκ ἦν διάκρισις (χωρισμός E.) ἐν αὐτοῖς οὐδεμία. The synonyms *διάκρισις* and *χωρισμός* are surely translations of an identical word in some other language. But not of a Latin word, for the difference between d. (*accusatio*!) and e. (*separatio*) is still more marked. The Syriac *phelguto* would suit very well, and then the gloss would be nothing more than a phrase imported (in the negative form by substitution of *l'it* for 'it) from John ix. 16. An importation from the Greek text of

* Individual cases of Latinisation in the Bezan Acts must, I think, be admitted. Mr. Chase allows that there may be "a very few passages scattered up and down the MS. in which the scribe, allowing his eye to wander to the Latin copy before him while he wrote the Greek, may have been influenced by the Latin in his transcription of a word or phrase of the Greek. But these instances of Latinisation . . . are at most very rare. . . . and do not affect the essential character of the text" (pp. 2, 3). A large element of Latinisation should, I think, be admitted in the Bezan text of the *Gospels*.

† D. d. indicate respectively the Greek and Latin texts of *Cod. Bezae*, E. e. those of *Cod. Laudianus*. Other abbreviations will be readily understood. Mere orthographic peculiarities, though not unimportant in themselves, are here neglected. As Mr. Chase follows, throughout his volume, the order of the text of *Acts*, a detailed reference to his pages will be unnecessary.

‡ "The Latin gloss appears as *in iudicium* in e . . . and in the equivalent *in iudicio* of d; but the Greek . . . is different. . . . Hence we see that the reading must be primitively Latin" (Harris, p. 197). Had he said "may be" or "might be" no one could object, but why "must be"?

John ix. is not to be thought of, for the Greek text there has neither *διάκρισις* nor *χωρισμός*, but *σχίσμα*.

vii. 24: D. adds *ἐκ τοῦ γένους* (*γένους αὐτοῦ*, E.) Again, the divergent Greek and the still more divergent Latin (*de genere suo*, d.; *de natione sua*, e.) put us on the search for a common original, possibly Syriac. It is in fact a characteristically Syriac gloss. Mr. Chase points out that precisely similar expansions occur in Acts x. 28, xiii. 26; 1 Thess. ii. 14 (Peshitto).

xi. 27: D. adds *ἦν δὲ πολλή ἀγαλλίασις* (d. *exaltatio*), *συνεστραμμένων* (d. *revertentibus*!) *δὲ ἡμῶν* (1) The first clause is probably imported from Acts viii. 8, but not from the Greek, which there has *χαρά*, nor from the Latin (*gaudium*). But the Syriac *chaduto*, which in viii. 8 represents *χαρά*, stands for *ἀγαλλίασις* in Luke i. 14, Heb. i. 9, Jude 24, and would fully account for this word in Acts xi. 27. (2) The second clause is perhaps imported from xx. 7; but again not from the Greek, which there has not *συνεστραμμένων* but *συνηγμένων*, nor from the Latin (*collectis*). The Syriac *kad k'nishinan* (xx. 7) would supply the necessary basis for the gloss.

So much for some of Mr. Chase's selected instances. To them I add three others, all from the closing verses of ch. ii.

ii. 37: D. has, "Then all they that were gathered together and heard were pricked in their heart, and some of them said." (1) The first addition to the current text may probably be due to assimilation, the passage from which it is borrowed being Luke xxiii. 48. "Then all they that were gathered together and saw," &c. But the gloss certainly cannot be referred to the Greek text of St. Luke (*καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαραγερόμενοι ὄχλοι*), whereas the phrase used in the Curetonian Syriac (*v'kullhun ailen desh-tauriv tamen*) precisely answers to the *πάντες οἱ συνελθόντες* of the Bezan gloss. (2) The insertion of "some of them" accords well with Syriac usage, for a precisely similar insertion (*v'noshin menhun*) has survived in the Peshitto text of ii. 41.

ii. 41: D. substitutes "believed" for "received" (his word). The Peshitto here has "received his word and believed;" and it is difficult to suppose that the Syriac addition and the Bezan substitution of "believed" are independent one of the other.

ii. 45: D. has, "And as many as had possessions . . . sold them," &c., where the current text has merely "And they sold their possessions," &c. The Bezan text precisely answers to the Peshitto Syriac (*vailen d'it 'vo l'hun kenyonno*). Again, it is possible that the Bezan substitution of *πάντες τε* ("all of them") for *καθημέραν* ("daily") in ii. 46 is due to a confusion between the Syriac *kulyom* ("daily") and *kulhun* ("all of them").

But it will be worth while briefly to examine one or two instances of longer glosses, and one or two in which rival

explanations are explicitly put forward by Mr. Harris and Mr. Chase.

xi. 2: D. has, "Now Peter was of a long time desirous to go to Jerusalem, and addressing the brethren he comforted them, holding a long discourse, and teaching them through the countries, and going to meet them (!); and he announced to them the grace of God," &c. The syntax of the passage is more rugged in the Greek than even in our bald translation.* Mr. Chase writes, "This long interpolation, a miniature *περίοδος Πέτρον*, is a striking example of the desire to assimilate the history of St. Peter to that of St. Paul. It is in fact a mosaic of phrases describing the movements of St. Paul" (p. 83). He believes, of course, "that this, like other Bezan glosses, came from the Syriac." And then he appends "a literal translation of the Syriac Vulgate of those passages which, as it seems to me, the *glossator* used, leaving it to the student to compare the Greek in each case." The passages referred to are rather numerous, and certainly not all conclusive. We can indicate only a few of them. (1) In Rom. i. 13, St. Paul says that he has "often" (*πολλάκις*) been desirous of going to Rome. Now the Greek *πολλάκις* here would not account for the Bezan *διὰ ἱκανοῦ χρόνου*. But the Peshitto has the phrase *zabnin sagiyin*, which might well be retranslated *ἐξ* (or *διὰ*) *ἱκανοῦ χρόνου* (Cf. Luke viii. 27, xxviii. 8, where *men zabno sagiyo* represents *ἐκ χρόνων ἱκανών* and *ἐξ ἱκανοῦ* respectively).† The desire of St. Paul to go to Jerusalem is suppressed in Acts xix. 21. (2) The clause "he comforted them holding much discourse and teaching them through the countries," might be derived from Acts xx. 2, "and when he (Paul) had gone round these places (*μέρη*) and comforted them with much discourse," and from xv. 32, "and with much discourse they (Paul and Barnabas) strengthened the brethren." Here, however, it must be admitted that the Greek text gives as good a basis for the gloss as the Peshitto, for the passages contain the expressions *πολὺς λόγος* and *ἐστήριξε*. It is just possible, however, that *χωρῶν* is a retranslation of the Syriac *atroto*, which in the Peshitto represents *μέρη* (xx. 2).

We next take a case from the very beginning of *Acts*.

* *Apropos* of this gloss I may quote a characteristic passage from Mr. Chase. "The old Syriac element in Codex E chiefly appears in the glosses which are adopted into the text. The Greek text in this MS. runs smoothly, and is not defaced by solecisms. The case of Codex D is wholly diverse. The disease of Syriacising, which in a mild form has attacked Codex E, has assailed Codex D with peculiar malignity; so violent are the paroxysms that at times the language of the Codex ceases to be coherent. Passage after passage becomes a chaos. These wild utterances are indeed invaluable when they are used as a guide to a right diagnosis of the disease. They show unmistakably in what company the Codex has been and from what country the disease has come. But they are also a measure of its extreme severity" (p. 134).

† The Philoxenian gloss has *b'qad zabno d'lo z'ur*, "a tempore non modico," which does not help us. It only reveals the effort to translate *ἱκανοῦ* more literally.

i. z: D. adds "and He commanded them to preach the gospel." This is one of the instances selected by Mr. Harris to throw the dependence of the Bezan Greek on its companion Latin text. The Latin gloss "*præcepit prædicare evangelium*" explains the words "*præcepit Apostolis*" which have occurred just before. But whereas the Latin repeats the same verb, the Greek uses two distinct verbs *ἐντειλάμενος . . . ἐκέλευσε*. Hence, he thinks, the Latin must be the original. But (1) the Syriac gloss in the margin of the Philoxenian also repeats the same verb which has previously occurred in the text; "*kad p'qad . . . vaph'qad*," so that Mr. Harris's argument proves just nothing as against Mr. Chase's view.* (2) Moreover, there is tolerably clear evidence that the Greek text of Bezan is *not* here dependent on its companion Latin, but *vice versâ*. For the familiar Greek construction *ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας ἀνελήμφθη* is barbarously rendered in d. "*in eum diem quem (!) susceptus est.*" (3) But if the Greek gloss did not originate from the Latin, then the Latin must have been derived from the Greek (as every one but Mr. Harris has supposed) and the source of the Greek gloss is still to be sought. It seems to be an importation from Mark xvi. 15, 19, 20, where our Lord's command "to preach the gospel" is made much of. But again the gloss does not reproduce the words of the *Greek* text of Mark xvi. When, however, we find that the Curetonian Syriac of St. Mark has rendered *μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι* by *men botar daphqad* (*μετὰ τὸ κελεύσαι*) the *ἐκέλευσε* of the gloss seems to be accounted for. In this case it will be observed that Mr. Chase is able to refer to a piece of the old Syriac version which has actually survived. But it might have been well to mention the "*kad p'qad . . . vaphqad*" of the Philoxenian margin.

We will now take a case in which Mr. Harris and Mr. Chase appear to us to be alike at fault.

v. 39: *discedite ergo ab hominibus istis*. These words are simply a resumptive repetition, after an intruded gloss ("*nec vos nec imperatores nec reges*"), of words occurring in the current text of v. 38 ("*discedite ab hominibus istis*"). But it is only in the Latin that the words are exactly repeated. D. has *ἀποστήτε* in v. 38, but *ἀπέχεσθε* in v. 39. Hence Mr. Harris concludes (p. 156) "the gloss is then a Latin one . . . its Greek is merely a retranslation." But even supposing that this must have been a verbal repetition in the original form of the gloss, the facts of the case prove only that the Latin may or might have been the original, not that it must have been. Mr. Chase writes, "the reason why the Bezan scribe wrote *ἀπέχεσθε* not *ἀποστήτε* (v. 38) is that he is translating a Syriac gloss." Again, it may be so; but why has not Mr. Chase given us the actual form of the Syriac gloss as it is found in the Philoxenian, where *archeq(u)* in v. 38 and *archeq(u) l'cun* in v. 39 would

* For either the two Greek verbs have been rendered by a single Syriac verb (*ph'qad*), and therefore might just as well have been both translated by the Latin *præcepit*, or else the repeated *ph'qad* of the Philoxenian has preserved an older Syriac form of the gloss.

account alike for the difference between the Greek verbs and for the verbal repetition in the Latin? It is, however, a pure assumption that the original glossator would have used a verbal repetition here. He might just as well have sought to avoid betraying himself by throwing the resumptive clause into a slightly different form. In this case the verbal parallelism would be due to the translator of the gloss, and not to the original glossator. If Mr. Harris will consult the Philoxenian Syriac here he will find *archeq(u)* in v. 38 and *archeq(u) l'cun* in v. 39. Yet he would no doubt agree with other scholars in believing the Philoxenian gloss to be a translation from the Greek. But if a Syriac translator could render the two Greek verbs by the *aphel* form of *r'chaq*, why should not a Latin translator have rendered them both by *discedite*? The true test, if any test can be found, of the origin of the gloss is probably to be looked for in the interpolated words οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε βασιλεῖς οὔτε τύραννοι (D.) which can hardly have been derived from the Latin gloss "nec vos nec imperatores nec reges" (d.). Mr. Chase's argument here is very ingenious if not quite conclusive. He notes in the first place that E. has the gloss in a simpler form οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν (e. "nec vos nec magistratus vestri"). This shorter gloss he takes to be the earlier, and he notes that a precisely similar opposition of ὑμεῖς and οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν occurs in the Bezan text of Acts iii. 17, where the T. R. has no ὑμεῖς before ἐπράξατε. For some reason which we confess ourselves quite unable to fathom he regards this opposition as a Syriasm. If this could be established he would undoubtedly have a good case, but we do not know that an emphatic *attun* is more characteristic of the Syriac than an emphatic ὑμεῖς of the Greek idiom. It is perhaps more to the point that in Mark xiii. 9, the Syriac versions (Curetonian and Peshitto) invert the order of the words ἡγεμονῶν καὶ βασιλέων, placing "kings" first. But again, as the Greek text of the parallel passage in Luke xxi. 12, places "kings" before "rulers," while both the Greek and the Syriac have "rulers" before "kings" in Matth. x. 18, it does not seem that any stress can be laid on the order "kings and rulers" as specially characteristic of the Syriac biblical usage.

Here, then, Mr. Chase has, I think, entirely failed to prove his point. In saying this, however, I do not wish to imply that the gloss in any way militates against Mr. Chase's hypothesis. Only it affords him no help towards its establishment. Our last example shall be one which Mr. Chase has not discussed, and where Mr. Harris seems to have committed once more the mistake of arguing *à posse ad esse*.

xiii. 12: D. has ἐθανμασεν . . . ἐκπλησσόμενος (d. miratus est . . . stupens) where T. R. has ἐκπλησσόμενος alone. Mr. Harris charges this tautological reduplication to the *tumor Africanus* (p. 199), which rejoiced in such pleonasms, and brings forward the instance "with the view of confirming the reader's belief in the fundamental latinity of these glosses."

Unfortunately for his theory he quotes a similar instance from Matt. xix. 25, where, he says, the gloss has "found its way into the Curetonian Syriac." But how if it "found its way" not *into*, but *out of*, the Curetonian? Similar instances of pleonasm are not wanting in that version. *E.g.*, Luke ii. 48, *in dolore et tristitia* (T. R. ὀδυνώμενοι); ii. 52, *crecscens . . . et proficiens* (T. R. προέκοπτε); xiii. 13, *et erecta est statura ejus*. The first two instances are supported indeed by D. d. and by old Latin sources, but in the third the Curetonian stands alone. The familiar Semitic construction of the infinitive absolute with a cognate finite verb is at least as closely related to ἐθαύμασεν . . . ἐκπλησσομένου as any case of *tumor Africanus*.

The above instances are, I think, fairly representative. On the whole we are disposed to cast our vote for Mr. Chase's hypothesis, which I may add does not appear in any way to contradict Mr. Ramsay's explanation of certain of the Bezan glosses. There is no reason that we can see why a native of Western Syria should not exhibit that knowledge of Asia Minor and that comparative unfamiliarity with Europe which Mr. Ramsay postulates for the chief *glossator*.

I do not, indeed, find myself able to follow Mr. Chase's reasoning in all of the very numerous passages which are discussed at great length in his learned volume. It is just possible that he may have somewhat injured his cause, which, we believe, to be substantially the cause of truth, by occasionally seeking to *prove* the Syriac origin of a particular Bezan reading in cases where nothing that deserves to be called a proof is forthcoming. Nevertheless, it is impossible not to admire the thoroughness and the perseverance with which he has submitted to discussion, not merely a few selected passages which might seem to make his case, but as far as possible every variant which is not of a merely trifling nature. His book is addressed not to the general public but to scholars, and we shall be much surprised if twenty years hence the learned world does not recognise that it was Mr. Chase—stimulated to the effort, as he himself admits, by Mr. Harris's monograph—who discovered the key to the Bezan problem, at least so far as it concerns the Acts of the Apostles.

"A lame and impotent conclusion!" we fancy we hear some of our readers saying. "Suppose that the 'Bezan Glosses' are derived from a Syriac origin, what of it? Of what possible interest can such an out of the way piece of information be to

any one but a faddist?" Nevertheless, *pace* the disappointed and possibly impatient reader, I agree with Mr. Chase when he says (p. 12): "I believe that I am justified in claiming for my results that they are of far-reaching importance. The light which they throw on many problems is, I believe, as clear as it is valuable." We will illustrate this remark with reference to *one* problem, the importance or at least the interest of which will, we think, be acknowledged on all hands, viz., that of the place and date of origin of the old Latin version of the New Testament. If the old Latin version of Acts is in some way dependent on the old Syriac, which is the conclusion to which Mr. Chase's researches seem to point, there is at least a presumption in favour of a similar relation between the old Latin and the old Syriac versions of the Gospels. And if it can be shown, as we believe it can, that that the old Syriac Gospels rest in their turn on the Diatessaron of Tatian; then it becomes possible to fix within a few years the date of the first Latin translation of at least a considerable portion of the New Testament. That such a translation was current in Tertullian's time can, we think, hardly be doubted. Yet there are serious grounds for thinking that in his day it had not attained that degree of authority which it possessed in the time of St. Cyprian. This agrees well with the hypothesis which would assign to the old Syriac version a date not far removed from A.D. 170 (*i.e.*, from ten to twenty years after the composition of the Diatessaron), and to the old Latin a date between A.D. 170 and 190. This conclusion, which is partly ours and partly Mr. Chase's, we must supplement by the fruitful suggestion put forward by him, or rather by an anonymous writer whom he quotes, "that the Latin version itself may have been made in Syria, and we will say boldly at Antioch" (p. 143). No other date or place of origin will, I believe, be found to account for the many-sided phenomena presented by the so-called (and unfortunately so-called) "Western Text" of the New Testament. The grounds for this conclusion cannot be here set forth; but the time is, we hope, not far distant when the term "Western" will, for the future, give place to the term "Syro-Latin," the only one which truly represents, in our opinion, the facts of the case.

HERBERT LUCAS, S.J.

POSTSCRIPT.—The foregoing article was already in the printer's hands before I had an opportunity of consulting Mr. Rendel Harris's "Four Lectures on the Western Text," published a few weeks since. Mr. Harris has brought fresh evidence to bear on the subject from two independent quarters. (1) In the course of last year the Mechitarist Fathers of St. Lazzaro at Venice, published a Latin translation of the Armenian version of St. Ephrem's commentary on the Pauline Epistles. This commentary contains several quotations from and allusions to the Acts, and the significant fact is that more than one of these quotations or allusions imply an early Syriac text of the Acts which contained the same glosses (in the places in question) as the Bezan text. (2) Although St. Ephrem's commentary on the Acts has perished, some fragments of it have been preserved in an American *catena*, and these fragments have been translated for the purpose of Mr. Harris's lectures by Mr. F. C. Conybeare. The evidence derived from these fragments is to the same effect as that of the Commentary on the Pauline Epistles. They exhibit an expanded or unabridged old Syriac text of the Acts closely akin to the text of *Codex Bezae*. It is with a generous appreciation of Mr. Chase's investigations that Mr. Harris writes:

From two separate lines of inquiry, therefore, we have discussed the question of the existence of an old Syriac text of the Acts [a text, moreover, closely resembling the Bezan], and have removed Mr. Chase's hypothesis into the region of fact. . . . We can only most cordially congratulate Mr. Chase on the complete and thorough verification of the assumption with which he commences his investigation into the peculiarities of the Western text. It is not often that a speculation is so rapidly justified from unexpected quarters. ("Lectures," p. 33.)

But to establish the existence of an Old Syriac text of Acts and its alliance with *Codex Bezae* and its congeners, is by no means the same thing as to establish the Syriac origin of the Bezan glosses; and here Mr. Harris and Mr. Chase once more part company. Or to speak more correctly, Mr. Harris shows himself inclined to accept in part Mr. Chase's conclusions, while he is at great pains to show that many, if not most, of the arguments by which those conclusions have been reached are strangely wide of the mark.

ART. III.—RINGS.

RINGS seem to have been known at a very early period : we find them in Celtic burial mounds ; they were common in Egypt ages before Jacob settled there, the early literature of the Jews alludes to them, and they are frequently mentioned by Greek writers. They seem in all cases, so far as we have any means of judging, to have been at first a distinguishing mark of the wealthy and noble, and then, by a process of natural growth, to have become common to all classes of the community.

Rings were used as types of, and held symbolically to represent, eternity, because they have neither beginning nor end ; this was especially so amongst the Hindoos, Persians and Egyptians.

The Egyptian priests in the temple of Phtha (the Vulcan of the Greeks), when they wished to represent the year, chose a serpent with its tail in its mouth in the form of a ring, and we find that these serpent-rings are known amongst other peoples. There are some fine specimens of Egyptian rings in this country ; one of the most remarkable of them is that which belonged to Amunoph III., who is said to have exercised royal supremacy from B.C. 1403 to B.C. 1367, and who is believed by some scholars to be the same individual as the Greek Memnon. This ring is of bronze, and has the name Amunoph engraved upon it ; it was at one period in the Londesborough collection, but I do not now know where it is. So common was the custom of wearing rings amongst the Egyptians that we find, comparatively speaking, large quantities of them in their tombs ; they are formed of various substances of little value, such as porcelain and ivory, and there are instances of carnelian rings being found near the Pyramids ; they were often engraved with gods and various other emblems of a more or less sacred character. From all we can discover it seems certain that nearly every member of the community wore rings of some kind or other, and there is, or was until a few years ago, a mummy case to be seen in the British Museum, of a woman whose left hand has no less than nine rings upon it.

We know that the Jews wore rings at a very early date ; they are spoken of several times in the Old Testament, and once in connection with Egypt, when we are told that Pharaoh invested Joseph with the ring off his own hand, so that all men might thereby recognise that whatsoever he did was done by the direct authority of the king.

But though rings seem to have been common in Egypt they did not, so far as we can now tell, equal the quantity that must have been worn by the Romans. Martial speaks of a man named Charinus who wore, so he would have us believe, no less than sixty rings daily. Senos Charinus omnibus digitis gerit.* They have been discovered in the burial urns both of the Greeks and of the Romans ; but the opinion has been held by some writers that in the case of those discovered in Roman places of burial, they had been secretly placed there by the friends of the departed, because it was contrary to the Roman law to inter gold with a deceased person.†

The most simple form of Roman rings, and the one which lasted longest, is exemplified by one which is said to have been found in the Roman camp at Silchester ; it is of gold, massively made, and the stone, which is carnelian, has a woman's figure on it : she is holding fruit and corn ; it may be meant for a representation of Ceres, but this it is impossible to say with certainty. Mr. Fairholt mentions this ring.‡ Roman and Greek rings have very often merely a name or greeting ; usually these greetings or mottoes are longer upon the latter than the former. Julius Cæsar wore a ring with a figure of Venus upon it. We are told that three bushels of rings were collected from amidst the spoil after the defeat of the Romans by Hannibal at Cannæ. The Romans are said in times of grief and sorrow to have laid aside their more costly rings of gold and precious stones and to have replaced them by iron ones. They have never been equalled in the cutting of stones and gems as intaglios, and so well was this understood all through the Middle Ages, that it was a common thing to reset Roman gems and put a modern inscription either on the stone itself or engraved on the setting.

* "Proc. Soc. Ant.," 2 S. I. 277.

† "Chambers's Repository (Curiosities of Burial)," pp. 18-19.

‡ "Rambles of an Archæologist," 1871, pp. 84-85. F. W. Fairholt, F.S.A.

A very good example of this occurs in the case of a ring said to have been found in 1845 at Sessa. The stone is jasper, cut as an intaglio; the device, two hands clasped; above the hands the letters C.C.P.S. and below them I.P.D.; most likely it has been a gift, and these are the initials of the giver and the receiver. The setting is gold, not earlier than the fourteenth century; the mediæval owner has had engraved round the gem, so as to form a legend for the seal,

+ SIGILLV. THOMASII. DE. ROGERIIS. DE. SVESSA.

The gold hoop of the ring is bevelled on each side, which admits of there being room for the following inscriptions upon it:

+ XPS. VINCIT. XPS. REGNAT. XPS. IMPERA.

+ ET. VERBU. CARO. FACTU : ET. ABITAVIT INOB.

Celtic rings have been found constantly in the grave mounds of Gaul, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, and Scotland; they are usually formed of pure gold wires plaited or twisted together: the number of strands vary much, rings having been found with as few as three strands and as many as eight. The gold being pure, is of course perfectly flexible, and can easily be twisted into any shape; these plaited Celtic rings are not very rare.

Anglo-Saxon rings are very interesting; sometimes they have a name upon them, but more often are found without it. One of the most historical of these that yet remain is in the British Museum; it belonged to the father of King Alfred the Great, Ethelwulf, king of Wessex, who reigned A.D. 836; his name is upon it; it was found at Laverstock in Hampshire. We know that at times the Anglo-Saxons used metals other than gold for their rings; a spiral one, formed of bronze, was discovered some years ago with a skeleton at Toddington, Bedfordshire, it consisted of rather less than two coils. There is a fine example of a Saxon ring in gold, found in Yorkshire in 1735, now to be seen in the Royal Museum at Copenhagen. Bishops wore rings from a very early period; they varied considerably at different times; they seem to have generally been formed of gold, but instances are known of other metals being used. There was a bishop's ring in the Londesborough collection which was made of copper and then gilded—it is set with a ruby.

During some repairs to the choir of Hereford Cathedral in 1843, the carved alabaster tomb of Bishop Stanbury* was moved; in it was found a massive gold ring set with a fine sapphire; the sides of this ring are very ornamental, being of dark enamel decorated with sprays of flowers; inside the ring is the motto, in black letter, "en bon an."†

A very early specimen of a bishop's ring was in the collection of Mr. Edmund Waterton, and was by him exhibited to the Society of Antiquaries in 1860; it had previously been exhibited before the same society in 1773. It is believed to have belonged to one Alhastan, who is said to have been Bishop of Sherborn from A.D. 823 to 867. It is composed of gold inlaid with niello, and is inscribed ALHSTAN, the final letter being, however, a rune; it was found at Lloyd-faen.

There is a bishop's ring in the custody of the deans of Winchester that was found during some alterations or repairs under the tomb of William Rufus, and is thought to have been the pontifical ring of that well-known prelate, Henry of Bloise.‡ It is massively formed, of solid gold, set with a large sapphire, which is not cut but merely polished, and which is held in its socket by three fleur-de-lys; and there is a hole drilled through the centre of the gem to admit of a gold wire being passed through it, in order still further to secure it in the setting. There seems to have been no idea in those days that by doing this the stone would become less valuable; it was by no means an uncommon thing to treat them so at this date and for long afterwards.

There are two very interesting rings kept in the sacristy at York Minster. They were discovered in the tombs of Archbishops Sewall§ and Grenefeld,|| and have been described and engraved by Fairholt.¶ In the fourteenth century bishops often wore their rings outside their gloves, and in some cases

* John Stanbury, bishop of Bangor, translated to Hereford, February 1452, died May 1474.

† "Rambles of an Archæologist," 109. F. W. Fairholt.

‡ Brother to King Stephen, elected Bishop of Winchester A.D. 1129. The exact time of his death is uncertain, but nearly all the chronicles place it in 1171. Le Neve (Hardy), "Fasti. Eccl. Anglic.," iii. 7.

§ Sewall de Bovill, Dean of York, was consecrated Archbishop 1256, died 1258.

|| William de Grenefeld, Dean of Chichester, Chancellor of England, consecrated Archbishop of York January 1305-6, died 1315.

¶ "Rambles of an Archæologist," p. 106.

the episcopal ring was a thumb ring; these two circumstances may perhaps account for the fact of the large size of many of the rings. The stones most commonly used in such rings were ruby, emerald, sapphire, and crystal; the ruby was supposed to be emblematic of the glory of the Church, the emerald of its tranquillity, the sapphire of its hope, and the crystal of its simplicity and pureness. All gems and stones were held to be typical of some virtue: the diamond signified faith, the amethyst humility, the onyx sincerity.

In the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1848 is engraved a brass ring, very thickly gilded, the hoop charged with the arms of Pope Pius II.* It has on it the cross keys and the tiara, between them *Papa Pio*. It is set with a large topaz; the sides of the ring have the beasts of the Revelation on them in high relief. This ring was included in the Waterton collection.

There are some rings which have attained great celebrity in the history of England. S. Edward the Confessor is said to have given one that he always wore to the Abbot of Westminster, either just before his death or during his last illness. The legend is that this ring was one day brought to him by a pilgrim, who averred that S. John the Evangelist had sent him to declare to the king that his death was not far distant. "S. Edward's Ring," as it was called, was kept for a long time at Westminster Abbey. Being regarded as a relic of the saint, it was used to cure falling sickness (epilepsy) and also for cramp. It is believed by some authorities that from these circumstances arose the custom of the kings of England blessing and distributing cramp rings. The sovereigns were believed to have had transmitted to them S. Edward's power of curing or of mitigating these diseases. So far as we can now discover, the rings seem to have been blessed for two distinct things: falling sickness (*comitialis morbus*) and cramp (*contracta membra*).†

Good Friday was the day set apart for the ceremony. The rings were fashioned out of both gold and silver. The household books of Henry IV. and Edward IV. tell us that the metal

* The celebrated Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, born in Tuscany 1405, chosen Pope in 1458, died at Ancona 1464. He was one of the most learned men in that learned age, and the author of several well-known works.

† *Notes and Queries*, 1 S. VII. 88.

from out of which they were formed was the king's offering to the Cross upon that holy day. The following entry occurs in the seventh and eighth of Henry IV. (1406): "In oblationibus Domini Regis factis adorando Crucem in cappella infra manerium suum de Eltham, die Parasceive, in precio trium nobilium auri et v solidorum sterlynge xxvs."

These rings were used until the Reformation, when the belief in their virtue, if it did not die out, was prevented from openly expressing itself.

Borde,* in his "Breviarie of Health," 1547, tells us, speaking of the cure for cramp: "The kynge's majestie hath a great helpe in this matter, in halowing crampe ringes and so given without money or petition."

Cardinal Wiseman exhibited a very interesting MS. before the Royal Archæological Institute in June 1851. It contains the ceremony for the blessing of these cramp rings; there can be but little doubt that it belonged to Philip and Mary, for their arms are blazoned at the beginning. The description of the ceremony is thus headed: "Certain prayers to be used by the quenes heignes in the consecration of the cramp rynges." Within the volume is an illumination which depicts the queen kneeling; and on each side of her a dish containing the rings.

Perhaps the most interesting historical ring that yet remains is the one that was found at Fotheringay, and which there can be but little doubt was lost by Mary Stuart whilst a captive there. It is of gold; on the bezel are MH, with a true lover's knot uniting them. Within the ring is the inscription: "HENRI. L. DARNLEY. 1565.," and a shield which is charged by a lion rampant, ensigned by a coronet. The late Mr. Edmund Waterton, in whose collection this ring was, says, "As there is no double treasure, the arms are probably those of the Dukes of Albany."†

The marriage of Mary and Darnley took place on July 29, 1565, and most likely this ring was a gift of the queen to her lover, but whether before or after the marriage we have no means of knowing. But, whether before his death or after-

* Andrew Borde, a Carthusian, but having studied medicine became physician to Henry VIII. He wrote, among other things, "Pryncples of Astronamyne," "Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge."

† "Proc. Soc. Ant.," 2 S. I. 278.

wards, it is evident that the ring was in Mary's possession at the time when she took refuge in England, only to find herself a lifelong prisoner.

A ring, said to be the one given by Queen Elizabeth to the Earl of Essex, and which she expected to receive again from him after his condemnation, but which the Countess of Nottingham kept back, was about twenty years ago in the possession of the Rev. Lord John Thynne. It is a beautiful specimen of the jeweller's art, the gold setting being of very delicate workmanship; but the most interesting thing about it is that the onyx with which it is set is cut as a cameo into a likeness of the Queen; the resemblance is most wonderful, though of course the portrait is only a very minute one. At the back of the onyx, in the inside of the ring, are blue enamel decorations, and the outside of the ring is engraved with floriated ornaments. Whether this ring be really the one given by Elizabeth to Essex we shall never know, but that it is of that date is certain, and its superior workmanship suggests the idea that it may possibly have been made by the celebrated Italian Valerio Vincentino; we know that he spent some time in England, working for the Queen and other people. It was at this date a common thing to leave memorial rings by will, or the money to buy them with. This practice has never quite died out, although it is much less common than it used to be. Some of these mourning rings were in the form of a death's-head, more especially at the latter end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the following century. Luther wore a gold ring of this description that is now preserved at Dresden; it had on it a small death's-head in enamel; round the setting were engraved the words, "Oh mors, ero mors tua."

Shakespeare left money by bequest to five friends for them each to buy a memorial ring with.

Charles II. wore in memory of his father one which had for a motto :

Char - Rex
Rem - obiit - ber
30 Jan. 1648.

And many of those who had fought for the king wore rings with the head of the "Blessed Martyr" on them. Some of these were made so as to conceal the portrait behind a stone or

gem. A good example of this was to be seen in the Londesborough collection—a table cut diamond set in an oval rim, opening by means of a spring showed underneath it a portrait of the king. It is said that only seven memorial rings were given away at the funeral of Charles I., but I do not know the authority for this statement.

Horace Walpole had one at Strawberry Hill, said to be one of the seven; it had on it the King's head and a death's-head; between the letters C. R. was the motto "Prepared to follow me." No doubt many of the Cavaliers would have memorial rings made at their own expense with mottoes, and perhaps portraits also; the tragedy would make them doubly anxious to have something that could be regarded in the light of a relic of the master, who, whatever his faults and shortcomings were, had inherited to the full the Stuart gift of being able to attach people to him and his cause. The custom of distributing memorial rings is not confined to England alone; on the death of the Emperor Nicholas of Russia black enamelled rings, made in the form of a snake, were given away; fastened to the head and within the body of the ring is a narrow band of metal, with the name of the Emperor and the date of his death on it; the band is held in its place in the same manner that a spring-measuring tape is; the snake has diamond eyes.

Thumb rings must have been very inconvenient, but they have been worn at various times. Chaucer mentions them; we are told, in "The Squieres Tale," how a knight rode into the hall where Cambuscan was sitting in state—

Ther came a knight upon a stede of bras,
And in his hond a brod mirrour of glas;
Upon his thombe he had of gold a ring.

There is mention made of this custom by Brome* in "The Northern Lass": "A good man in the city wears nothing rich about him, but the gout or a thumb ring." A silver thumb ring was discovered in the parish of Surfleet, Lincolnshire, in 1857, with the initials H. B., and two merchants' marks on it. I do not know what became of this ring.

From a very early period, most likely always, rings have been

* Richard Brome. This dramatist was originally a servant of Ben Jonson. Died 1632.

worn as charms; amythists set in them were supposed to prevent drunkenness, crystal clouded if harm came near the wearer, amber was valuable against poison, turquoises turned pale when danger came nigh their owner; but of all gems and stones, toadstone was considered as the most valuable of safeguards to wear in a ring. It is trap-rock, the colour varies to some extent, but is usually a dull opaque or semi-opaque brown, very ugly; this stone was believed to have the power of giving warning of the presence of poison by changing its colour; and if poison had been swallowed it was of sovereign value if pounded up and taken. The most valuable form in which the stone could be worn was to have it set in a ring and a toad carved upon it; it was supposed to have come out of the head of toads. Fenton,* writing in 1569, says: "There is found in the heads of old and great toads, a stone which they call borax or stelon." It was considered very difficult to obtain, for the toad "envieth so much that man should have that stone."† That there were spurious toadstones passed off as the real thing is shown by the following directions for ascertaining their genuineness: "Holde the stone before a toad, so that he may see it, and if it be a right and true stone, the toad will leap towards it and make as though he would snatch it from you."‡

It appears from what we can make out upon the subject, that a stone obtained from a living toad was considered more powerful than if the animal was killed to get it. The proper receipt for carrying out this apparently difficult feat is more simple than would have been supposed, and it consists in merely putting the toad on a piece of scarlet cloth, "where-withal they are much delighted so that while they stretch out themselves upon that cloth they cast out the stone of their head but instant they sup it up again unless it be taken from them through some secret hole in the same cloth.§

It is to be feared that many people have found themselves in the same position as did Boethius, who relates how he laid a toad on a piece of red cloth, and then sat up all night

* Edward Fenton, "Certaine secrete Wonders of Nature." London, 1569.

† Thomas Lupton, "A Thousand Notable Things." London, 1586.

‡ *Ibid.*

§ Masarius. Quoted from "Rambles of an Archæologist," p. 117. F. W. Fairholt.

watching to see the stone cast out of its head, but the toad did not give him this satisfaction. There was a fine example of a toadstone ring with a toad carved upon the stone, in the Londesborough collection.

The hoof of the ass was supposed to possess great talismanic virtue, and in the Waterton collection was a ring formed from the hoof of some animal, most probably an ass; it was banded with silver, and set with a toadstone; the combination of two such things possessing each of them talismanic virtues in so high a degree would doubtless unite in forming a ring of very great power. Its date is supposed to be sixteenth century. The belief in the power and efficacy of toadstone lasted until very recent times; Joanna Baillie, writing to Sir Walter Scott in 1812, says: "A toadstone, a celebrated amulet, which was never lent to any one unless upon a bond for a thousand merks* for its being safely restored. It was sovereign for protecting newborn children and their mothers from the power of the fairies, and has been repeatedly borrowed from my mother for this purpose."

A writer in *Notes and Queries*† speaks of a toadstone ring in his possession. "It is a convex circular stone, eleven sixteenths of an inch in diameter, semi-transparent and of dark grey colour. . . . It is set in a massive silver thumb ring of great antiquity, and has been in the possession of my family for many generations."

Shakespeare alludes to the belief in the magical and medicinal properties of the toadstone when he says—

Like the toad, ugly and venomous,
Yet wears a precious jewel in his head.‡

Ben Jonson says—

His saffron jewel, with the toadstone in't.§

Rings inscribed with the names of the Magi were popularly supposed to ward off disease, accidents, and sudden death. As might naturally be supposed, Cologne was a great centre

* The value of the merk or mark was thirteen pence and one-third of a penny sterling.

† 4 Series, VII. 399.

‡ "As you like it," act 2, sc. i.

§ "The Fox," act 2, sc. iii.

for their sale; many of them were silver and had, in addition to the names of the "Three Kings of Cologne," "Ave Maria, gratiæ plena," outside them.

In the collection of works of art and antiquities exhibited at Ironmongers' Hall in 1861, was a silver charm ring inscribed in black letter with the names of the three Wise Men, between each name a tiny rose; this ring was found at Great Yarmouth, and is considered to be of the fifteenth century.

A writer in *Notes and Queries* describes a very fine specimen of a ring of this kind that was found in Surrey. It is a simple band of gold, having on the outside the Passion and crosses in white enamel; and the following inscription in black letter:

the well of pittie,
the well of merci,
the well of comfort,
the well of gracy,
the well of ewerlasting lyffe.

Inside the inscription is remarkably interesting—

+ vulnera = quinq̃ = dei = sunt = medicina = mei pia
+ crux = et = passio = xpi = sunt = medicina = michi = jasper =
+ melchior = baltasar = ananzapta = letgram = mator.

It is said that the "wells" are the wounds on the hands, feet, and side of Our Lord.

In Pugin's "Glossary Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume" (Plate 63) there is a representation of these wells to be seen, and further on (Plate 65) another version of them is given, in which the blood from these wells or fountains is flowing into chalices. Sir Edward Shaw, goldsmith, and Alderman of London, directed by his will in 1484 that there should be made "16 ringes of fyne gold to be graven with the well of pitie, the well of mercy, and the well of everlasting life."* In the Waterton collection was an exceedingly curious ring of fifteenth-century date, made of horn and silver plaited together and inscribed—JASPAR. MELCHOIR. BALTHASAR; it was exhibited before the Society of Antiquaries in 1864. Many very interesting rings have been exhibited before this Society, one in 1849 that was found amongst the ruins of the Priory of Frithelstoke, Devon. It is a gold ring of the time of Edward

* *Notes and Queries*, 4 S. X. 438.

IV. or Henry VII., and on one side is a representation of the Blessed Virgin and Holy Child, and on the other the Martyrdom of S. Thomas of Canterbury. No doubt there may be other specimens of rings yet remaining with the martyrdom of Beckett on them, but they must be very rare. I do not at this moment call one to mind. Representations of Our Lady with her Son are often to be met with upon rings; a gold one was found at Whitchurch, Salop, with the Trinity on it: the Father seated, between His knees the Crucified Son, and the Dove hovering over the left shoulder of the seated figure; round the circle a band with the motto—*EN BONE FOY*.

In 1780 an interesting gold ring was found by the sexton in the churchyard at Southwell whilst he was digging a grave; cut very deeply in the inner side of the ring is—

+ MI + MOVRI + QUE + CHANGE + MA + FOY +

The cross at the beginning is the same size as the letters, while those between the words are very small. There are mediæval rings found with the hoop ornamented by round or semi-round knobs or bosses; they have usually ten or eleven of these decorations, and have been considered and called Rosary, or decade rings. There was one exhibited before the Society of Antiquaries by Mr. Waterton in 1860; on the bezel are the figures of S. Barbara and S. Christopher, and within, in black letter—a. ma. vye. The striking thing about this ring is that it has thirteen of these bosses. There does not seem to be any reason, so far as we know, why S. Christopher and S. Barbara should be placed together; but amongst the many legends relating to the former Saint is one which says that no one who has gazed upon a representation of the Saint will die during the same day; thus a person with such a ring might gaze upon it every day. Most likely Barbara was the name of the owner of the ring. No doubt it was to a ring of this kind that John Baret of Bury St. Edmunds alludes when he, in 1463, describes in his will “a ryng of gold with bolyonys.”

The late Mr. Edmund Waterton, who probably knew more about rings than any one else of his day, and who had the finest collection of them ever brought together in private hands, said that he had seen but one ring with the names of the four Evan-

* Bury, “Wills and Inventories” (Camden Soc.), p. 36.

[No. 11 of *Fourth Series*.]

gelists on it—it was in his possession—a plain gold hoop of the fourteenth century, within it AVE MARIA GRA PLENA DNS. and on the outside ✠ MARCVS, LVCS. MATEVS. IOHES. Perhaps the most well-known ring in the world is the “Ring of the Fisherman,” the signet used for signing certain briefs issued from the Papal Court. This ring is formed of steel, and a new one is made for each succeeding Pope; the old one having been defaced as soon as the late Pope is dead and the authority passed into the College of Cardinals. The seal represents S. Peter sitting in a boat letting down nets into the sea for fish; he uses both hands, and is depicted letting a net down on each side the boat; the forms of both boat and saint show how very old the design must be. Above the head is inscribed “Leo XIII. Pont. Max.”

Serjeants-at-law on being sworn in presented rings to many official personages, and also to the sovereign; these rings had each a motto on them, not the family or personal motto of the new serjeant, but one chosen by him for the occasion. The ring presented to the sovereign was usually larger than the others and was enamelled.

The earliest recorded one is that of Sir J. Fineux in 1485, “*Suæ quisque fortunæ faber* ;” the next that of Serjeant, afterwards Lord Chief Justice, Montague in 1531, “*Æquitas justitiæ norma*.”* At times it was the custom for all serjeants created at one time to use the same motto; thus when fourteen were created in 1660 the motto used by them all was a chronogram alluding to the Restoration—“*aDest CaroLVs magnVs*.”†

There is an interesting allusion to this custom in the “Fifth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission,” p. 383 : “30 April, 1692. This day were installed the call of new serjeants, and Sir J. Hoby made Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas; the formality of walking was dispensed with, by reason of the exceeding wet weather, they being carried in coaches. The motto for their rings is ‘*Lex arma*.’”

There is a curious custom at Lincoln that, I believe, is still in existence. The mayor, once during his year of office, sends his official ring to the principal schools, and it is a breach of etiquette if the pupils have not a holiday given them. This

* *Notes and Queries*, 6 S. X. 30.

† *Ibid.*, 132.

somewhat resembles the use at Winchester, where the head boy (Prefect of Hall), if he had successfully begged a holiday (remedy) from the head-master, received a gold ring (the remedy ring), which he returned in school to the master upon the following day.

Poesy rings are perhaps the most interesting form that rings have ever assumed ; but without devoting an entire paper to them it would be impossible to give more than the barest outline of the subject. There are nearly a thousand "poesies" known of, some of them mere doggerel, some very beautiful. They were common in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and are known of much earlier. They are usually found inside wedding rings, but are to be seen on others also, as people often had them engraved upon rings which they gave to friends. One of the commonest is—

In thee my choyce
I do rejoyce.

John Dunton, the noted bookseller and publisher, was born in 1659 and died in 1733. On his wife's wedding ring was a well-known and frequently used poesy—

God saw thee
Most fit for me.

A very beautiful and far less known one is—

I seek to be
Not thine, but thee.

It is to be found in an old common-place book of the seventeenth century in the library at Sion College, amongst a list of poesies.

A curious feature in some of these wedding-ring poesies is that they appear to regard death as an eternal separation, and to imply that after the death of the husband or wife no more faith was to be expected. The following is an instance of this, and is very often found on rings—

Keepe faith till death.

Then there is the well-known one—

Till death us part
Thou hast my heart,

which seems to teach much the same doctrine. A great contrast to these is the following beautiful motto—

This and the giver
Are thine for ever,

which is, perhaps, taking it all in all, the most perfect example of expressing much in few words that ring-lore can show.

A very curious poesy is on an enamelled gold ring found in the river at Norwich. To the best of my belief it does not exist elsewhere, and was no doubt composed expressly for this ring—

Valued may greater B
Love

(Love undervalued may greater be.)

Henry VIII. gave a ring to Anne of Cleves with “God send me well to keep” upon it, a somewhat curious motto for him to have chosen.

A large gold ring was found at Terling, Essex, on which was engraved—

Where hearts agree
There God will be.

And in digging a drain at Iffley, Oxfordshire, one was turned up with the soil, having on it—

I lyke my choice.

Some mottoes are in Latin, following the fashion of Chaucer’s “Prioress,” who had graven on her bracelet—

Amor vincit omnia.

The writer has seen a modern ring made of silver with a coat of arms on it for sealing letters, and inside it—

More faithful than fortunate.

This saddest of all mottoes for rings is of very early date. Very beautiful are the words found on a ring evidently given to a friend—

Thy friend am I
And so will die.

One cannot help wondering whether the friendship was valued; possibly it was cast aside as little worth, a thing to

be forgotten and held of no account; but "many waters cannot quench love" and true friendship—they are eternal.

Much has been written as to the ancient forms and ceremonies used in placing the ring upon the finger during the marriage service. In the Hereford, York and Salisbury Missals the ring is directed to be put upon the first, second, third, and fourth fingers successively, where it is then to remain. Of course it must be understood that the thumb is here considered in the light of the first finger—"quia in illo digito est quidam vena procedens usque ad cor." The old belief was that a vein from the fourth finger ran more directly to the heart than from any of the others.

In Germany, Russia and Scandinavia betrothed couples exchange rings either beforehand or during the marriage ceremony. The ring was in early times given at the espousals, not during the wedding rites; it was used as an arrah* or earnest of a future marriage. The origin of the marriage ring as distinct from the betrothal one has been traced to the tenth century. One of the most interesting historical wedding rings that yet remain is Luther's. It is of gold, very massive, with the emblems of the Passion upon it, and also a representation of the crucifixion. A small ruby is set in the ring just above the Saviour's head inside the ring is inscribed: "D. Martino Luthero Catharin au Boren, 13 Juni, 1525." Gemil, or gemmel rings were common in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; they were at first only the ordinary double ring, which can be closed so as to form but one, but afterwards three and even four rings were included in one, but they still retained the same name. There is a very curious kind of wedding ring in use in Madeira. It consists of a gold ring with two hands clasped; on pulling each hand the ring opens (each hand being in truth a separate ring), and then is seen a third ring, having two hearts side by side upon it. When the hands are closed the three rings are then one. There are many omens and superstitions connected with wedding rings. Some people consider it most unlucky if a wedding ring should be lost; if it breaks, it is regarded as a sure sign that either the husband or wife will soon die. A

* Pelliccia's "Polity of the Christian Church" (translated by Bellet first ed., 1883, p. 320.

great-great-grandmother of the writer's snapt her wedding ring by some mischance or other; her husband was a sailor and at the time the ring broke he was at sea; the ship was lost during that voyage and my great-great-grandfather drowned with most of his crew, and it was always believed that the breaking of the ring was sent as a warning of what was about to happen. But the superstitions and omens to be drawn from weddings are far too numerous to mention save in an article devoted to folklore.

FLORENCE PEACOCK.

ART. IV.—THE HIGHER CRITICISM AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

WE have no sympathy with Professor Huxley's views on the sacred Scriptures. Still, it cannot be denied that there is a certain amount of force in what he says, in a recently-published volume of his essays, concerning the present attitude of many Christian apologists towards the writings of the Old Testament.

Apologetic effort, at present [he says],* appears to devote itself to the end of keeping the name of "Inspiration" to suggest the divine source, and consequent infallibility, of more or less of the Biblical literature, while carefully emptying the term of any definite sense. For "plenary inspiration" we are asked to substitute a sort of "inspiration with limited liability," the limit being susceptible of indefinite fluctuation in correspondence with the demands of scientific criticism. Where this advances that at once retreats. It is easy to say [he continues a few lines further on], and sounds plausible, that the Bible was not meant to teach anything but ethics and religion, and that its utterances on other matters are mere *obiter dicta*; it is also a specious suggestion that inspiration, filtering through human brains, must undergo a kind of fallibility contamination; and that this human impurity is responsible for any errors, the existence of which has to be admitted, however unwillingly.

The above passage, though somewhat exaggerated in tone, undoubtedly describes the position of the great majority of Christian apologists, outside the Catholic Church, on the matter of sacred Scripture. It is moreover true that of late years the aggressive attitude and wide prevalence of the "higher criticism" has led not a few Catholic writers to seek an explanation of the difficulties arising in the sacred text, from the more recent discoveries of science and archæology, in a toning down or restriction of the full meaning of the term "Inspiration."

In a recent number of this REVIEW,† the writer has dealt with the attitude of Cardinal Newman and Professor Mivart on the subject. On the continent many publications have appeared from Catholic pens in a similar sense. Thus François Lenor-

* "Science and Hebrew Tradition," p. vii.

† July, 1893.

mant, a man who was in the front rank of archæologists, gave expression to some novel views a few years ago in his work, entitled, “*Les Origines de l'Histoire d'après la Bible*”; among other things laying down that inspiration was not inconsistent with the presence in Scripture of “traditions, formed spontaneously in the course of ages, common to the Hebrews with peoples who were without the assistance of any light, save such as is natural to man, and with peoples given over to the errors of polytheism.”*

Lenormant's influence was deeply felt in France; and since his time more plain-spoken pronouncements, perhaps to some extent due to his example, have appeared from the French press. Salvatore di Bartolo, a Roman doctor of theology and canon law, recently published a book in Italian, which was translated into French by an Oratorian Father, treating, among other subjects, of Holy Scripture.† Nor was the book unfavourably received; on the contrary, there are printed therein letters of approbation from Cardinal Manning and others of high position in the Church. In this volume the author recognises different grades of inspiration, and lays down,‡ among other propositions, that “Inspiration is at its *minimum*, in matters of the extra-religious order, and that this *minimum* of inspiration does not guarantee the infallibility of the human agent.”

Monseigneur d'Hulst, Rector of the Catholic University of Paris, has also recently published an able and interesting paper on “*La Question Biblique*,”§ in which, moved by the strides made within the last half century by Biblical science, he seems disposed to recede from the commonly received Catholic teaching on inspiration. He lays down that there are three schools of exegesis within the Church, “forming, so to say, in the army of Biblical defenders, a right wing, a left wing, and a centre.”|| The right wing is composed of those who hold the ordinary doctrine of Catholics on sacred Scripture. The centre forms a kind of compromise between the two extremes. Those who make up the left wing hold indeed that the entire Bible is

* Preface, p. xvi.

† “*Les Critères Théologiques*,” Paris, 1889.

‡ P. 254.

§ *Le Correspondant*, Jan. 25, 1893.

|| P. 23. We quote the article in pamphlet form.

inspired, and that inspiration "guarantees Scripture from all error in matters of faith and morals; but that the preservation from error extends no farther; it would therefore have the same limits as the infallibility of the Church" (p. 24). Though most of the article is taken up with an explanation and defence of the left wing, Mgr. d'Hulst himself seems to favour rather the policy of the centre.*

We shall allude only to one more Catholic writer, of views tending in the same direction. P. Savi, a Barnalite, wrote, in March of last year, a letter to *La Science Catholique*, upon the controversy arising out of Mgr. d'Hulst's article to the *Correspondant*. P. Savi writes in a very cautious way; still, the practical result of his principles seems to us the same as in the case of the other writers we have been noticing. Thus he writes† that "God has left a certain personal initiative to the sacred writer, in matters of fact, in such cases as do not enter into the special end he had in view." In such cases "Dieu n'a pas jugé à propos d'écarter de l'esprit des hagiographes les inexactitudes. Elles y sont restées et se sont réfléchies dans leurs écrits."

The instances we have adduced are sufficient to show that a more or less widely spread tendency has manifested itself of late, within the Church, to take a looser view of inspiration, to restrict its meaning, we might almost say, to combat the Higher Criticism, by ceding to it the field of battle.

Now, it would be the height of presumption on my part to censure the views of any theologian. Nor am I disposed to attempt any such proceeding. I recognise to the full the high and worthy motives which actuated the writers to whom we have referred; and I fully appreciate the difficulties which moved them to write as they did. At the same time, however, I cannot conceal from myself that the recent Encyclical of the Holy Father looks with more than disapproval upon such principles, and that after its publication, loyal Catholics will seek the settlement of Scripture perplexities upon other lines. To make this clear, I will quote a short passage

* Mgr. d'Hulst sent a letter to the Pope thanking him for, and expressing his cordial adhesion to, the Encyclical on Scripture, and was honoured by a Rescript from his Holiness.

† P. 296.

from the Encyclical, to show the teaching of the sovereign Pontiff on the subject of inspiration, referring the reader for further information to that document itself.

So far is it from being possible that any error can co-exist with inspiration, that inspiration not only is essentially incompatible with error, but excludes and rejects it, as absolutely and necessarily as it is impossible that God Himself, the supreme Truth, can utter that which is not true.*

Still, though I think, as apparently does M. Loisy,† that Catholic writers will not *now* endeavour to defend the sacred Scriptures, on the principles advocated by the authors to whom I have been referring, I must on the other hand make it quite clear that I have no sympathy with the position taken up by Mr. Gore, regarding the Encyclical, in a recent number of the *Guardian*.‡ As a matter of fact I entirely repudiate his interpretation of the Pope's teaching on inspiration; and his estimate of the authority which that document possesses for Catholics.

With regard to the authority of the recent papal letter, Mr. Gore writes: "Any one can see from reading the Encyclical that it is meant to be an *ex cathedra* pronouncement." Still, he tells us that "no doubt some reason may be found—has, in fact, been found—to declare the Encyclical not infallible"; and accordingly he magnanimously declares himself willing to waive the question of its *ex cathedra* character.

In reply to all this I may observe that no Catholic would deny the Pope's right to issue an infallible decree on the question of inspiration, or that such a pronouncement might take the form of an Encyclical. But we differ from Mr. Gore in thinking that the recent Encyclical was not intended to be an infallible utterance. The Pope no doubt lays down therein, in emphatic terms, the ordinary teaching of theologians respecting inspiration, but from that it does not follow that he wished to bind the faithful by an *ex cathedra* pronouncement. Had he intended to exercise his prerogative of infallibility, it is incredible that he would not have set that down as the primary object of the Encyclical, whereas we know his motive to have

* Authorised Translation, p. 26.

† Cf. *L'Enseignement Biblique*. Last no.

‡ April 11.

been "to give an impulse to the noble science of Holy Scripture, and to impart to Scripture study a direction suitable to the needs of the day."* Moreover, the discursive and even rhetorical form and style of the Encyclical do not seem to us to indicate the intention of defining. Had the Pope wished to add anything to the decrees of Trent and the Vatican, we may be sure his language would have been unmistakable, precise and formal; nor should we have had Mr. Gore discovering that the doctrine of the Encyclical was nothing but "verbal inspiration," whilst an article writer in the *Spectator* † writes that "there he (Mr. Gore) is, we think, mistaken. Certainly no such assertion is made."

It seems hardly necessary to point out the absurdity of Mr. Gore's contention, that, though the Encyclical was intended to be an *ex cathedra* utterance, Catholics have already discovered a pretext for declaring it not infallible. The Papal letter was published on the 18th of November. Mr. Gore writes on the 11th of April. Meanwhile, Catholic theologians have studied the Encyclical, and declared it not to be an *ex cathedra* pronouncement. There is no concealment; the Holy Father knows what has been said; nor has anything happened to change his view of the situation. If he really intended the Encyclical to contain a formal definition of doctrine, he has only to say so, in order to bind the consciences of the faithful. Why then does he remain silent? Simply because Catholic theologians have correctly interpreted his intention.

Mr. Gore's opinion as to the teaching of the Encyclical regarding inspiration is contained in the two following passages:

It is nothing whatever but an assertion by the Pope of "verbal inspiration," as the indubitable doctrine of the Church. Naturally, therefore, he condemns unhesitatingly any limitation of inspiration, in the sense in which it involves infallibility, to the things of faith and morals, and (by implication) the accompanying recognition of grades of inspiration.

Again :

Nothing is to be allowed but such apologetics as can be based on the assumption that there are no discrepancies, even minute, between Kings and Chronicles, or one part of the Bible and another (when once the true

* Authorised Translation, p. 4.

† April 28.

text is ascertained), that alike the narrative of Genesis i.-xi., and that of Daniel, nay, those of Tobit and Judith, are in the strict sense historical, and that the Pentateuchal legislation, as put into the mouth of Moses, is all strictly Mosaic.

From these passages it will be seen that Mr. Gore considers the Encyclical to teach "verbal inspiration." Nay, more! He places the words in inverted commas, as if to show that he uses them in their strict technical sense. Had he studied the Encyclical more impartially, it certainly seems to us that he would have modified his conclusion. Even the strictest passages which it contains are susceptible of explanation, without having recourse to verbal inspiration; and, surely, in such a case we should act on the principle *in dubiis libertas*. But, that they are meant to be so interpreted, in accordance with the general teaching of theologians, who reject almost unanimously verbal inspiration, is clear from other passages in the letter, as, for instance, where we are told that the sacred writers described things "in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were commonly used at the time" (p. 24); and again, that they "went by what sensibly appeared." Surely these passages are inconsistent with the doctrine that even word and phrase were supplied by the Holy Ghost.

But there is another passage which seems to have escaped Mr. Gore's notice. After dealing with the relation between physical science and Scripture, the Pope continues: "The principles here laid down will apply to cognate sciences, and especially to history." What is the meaning of these words? It is a well-known tenet of the higher critics, that in olden times men had a lower standard of accuracy in writing history than we have in these days. May we then say that the Pope wishes us to make allowance for this diversity in the interpretation of sacred Scripture? Certainly not. Such an explanation of the words would be out of harmony with the general tenor of the Encyclical. But still, the passage seems to me to mean, that, in dealing with the Old Testament, we ought to take into consideration the ordinary ideas about literary composition, prevalent in the days of the writers.

Thus, the Church finds no difficulty in the fact that the Book of Wisdom, though clearly not composed by Solomon, is written in the person of Solomon. Because it was a common

practice in those days to ascribe that class of literature to Solomon. It was a well-understood literary device. On the same principle some Catholics deny the Solomonian authorship of the Canticle and Ecclesiastes; and no one is disturbed to know, that a large proportion of the *Psalterium Davidicum* was not the work of David. That being so, and the principle being, as it seems to us, admitted in the Encyclical, how can it be rightly said that Catholics are now bound to hold all the Mosaic legislation to be "strictly Mosaic," because it is "put into the mouth of Moses." We reply to Mr. Gore that the matter remains precisely where it was before the publication of the Encyclical.

Neither has anything been settled as to the first eleven chapters of Genesis. It is still open to us—as it was to St. Thomas and the Fathers—to discuss, whether there is any, and if so, how much allegory in that portion of the Pentateuch. Nor have we any *new* obligation to hold that Tobit and Judith "are in the strict sense historical." The higher critics declare that Chronicles, Tobit, Judith and other books are instances of Jewish *Haggadah*, or idealised history; that is to say, that they are narratives, intended to convey some moral lesson, not strictly historical, but founded on history. That, in the abstract, such books might be present in the Bible, there is no reason to deny. Indeed, some Catholic writers maintain that neither Judith* nor Tobias† are strictly historical, in other words that they are Jewish *Haggadah*. Whatever be said on that matter, it is clear that the Encyclical does not affect the question one way or the other. If anything it recognises a principle favourable to the possibility of the *Haggadah* among the sacred books.

So much for Mr. Gore's criticism of the Papal Encyclical. From the remarks I have made on it, it will be evident that, though I do not think that the authors, to whom I referred some little way back, can *now* continue to defend the theories of inspiration which they were before disposed to favour, I am led to this conclusion, not because we hold the Encyclical to be an *ex cathedra* pronouncement, but because we look upon it as a weighty and important exhortation and exposition of

* Jahn, Movers, Scholz.

† Dereser, Scholz.

doctrine, addressed with great solemnity to the church, and to be submitted to and loyally carried out by the faithful.

But if the harmonisation of the doctrine of Scripture inspiration with the teachings of archaeology and history is not to be effected by a retrograde movement on the part of Catholic theologians, it would seem that there is now more prospect of the same desirable end being attained by the new light that is being thrown every day from the monuments of antiquity on the books of the Old Testament. The Papal Encyclical was published on the 18th of November last. A few days later appeared from the press Professor Sayce's book on "The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments," a work which, it seems to us, is of good omen for the future prospects of Catholic Old Testament exegesis.

Let it, however, be clearly understood that we are far from being able to approve of all Professor Sayce sets forth in his latest publication. As far as the literary analysis of the Hexateuch is concerned, he is substantially in accord with the higher critics. The same may be said as to his views on the writings of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and others of the prophets. Moreover, we totally dissent from his views on the Book of Daniel. Nor are we able to agree with all he says as to the historical value of many of the Old Testament books. But, allowance being made for all this, I still assert that what Professor Sayce brings forward as the verdict of the monuments in regard to sacred Scripture is full of promise for the future.

That Professor Sayce is in the front rank of archaeologists is admitted by all. Dr. Driver calls him the "foremost English representative" of archaeology*; and Canon Cheyne says that "he is probably unsurpassed in his knowledge of the data of the inscriptions."† But, moreover, Canon Cheyne couples him with the name of Schrader—perhaps the most eminent of living Assyriologists—among the founders of Old Testament criticism, and writes of the two as follows: "Both have been compelled to drop behind as Old Testament critics, so eager and rapid has been the advance of recent criticism" (p. 230).

Surely, there is something suspicious in this "eager and rapid advance of recent criticism"! Especially when the two

* "Archæology and the Higher Criticism." *Contemporary*, March, p. 425.

† "Founders of Old Testament Criticism," p. 231.

most accomplished archaeologists of the day find themselves compelled to differ from the critics! Seeing, moreover, that such a man as Professor Sayce is of opinion that the critics have been going ahead altogether too fast!

The arrogance of tone adopted at times [he says]* by the "higher criticism" has been productive of nothing but mischief; it has aroused distrust even of its most certain results, and has betrayed the critic into a dogmatism as unwarranted as it is unscientific. Baseless assumptions have been placed on a level with ascertained facts, hasty conclusions have been put forward as principles of science, and we have been called upon to accept the prepossessions and fancies of the individual critic as the revelation of a new Gospel. [Again]. There are popes in the "higher criticism" as well as in theology.

Judging by his article on "Archæology and the Higher Criticism,"† it is evident that Dr. Driver is dissatisfied with Professor Sayce for the way in which he speaks of the higher criticism in his recent work. First of all, with great pomp and circumstance, taking his own book on the "Literature of the Old Testament" as a standard of reference, he proceeds to show that Professor Sayce's conclusions scarcely appreciably affect the results of recent criticism (pp. 409, 410); then he declares that "Professor Sayce uses the terms 'higher critic' and 'higher criticism' where he really means 'hyper-critic' and 'hyper-criticism'" (p. 410, *cf.* 425). Finally, he refers as unjust to "the charge or insinuation, that 'higher critics' generally neglect archæology" (p. 411, *cf.* 410). In regard to the first point, Dr. Driver might have spared himself the trouble; for it is perfectly evident to any reader of Professor Sayce's work (what, indeed, Dr. Driver himself, curiously enough, admits elsewhere (*e.g.*, p. 425)) that he admits substantially the results of the literary analysis of the Old Testament. As to the second point, we cannot agree with Dr. Driver. No doubt if Dr. Driver were taken as the incarnation of the "higher criticism" much of Professor Sayce's book would require modification. But then Dr. Driver must know perfectly well that he lags somewhat behind the critical host. I only bring forward one quotation to illustrate the fact, and that shall be from his friend Canon Cheyne. What does Canon Cheyne say of Dr.

* "Higher Criticism and the Monuments," p. 5.

† *Contemporary*, March, 1894.

Driver's "Literature of the Old Testament"?* "The book is to a certain extent a compromise." "Dr. Driver is free in his criticism up to a certain point, but then suddenly stops short." Besides, even if Professor Sayce's words do not apply to Dr. Driver, they apply largely, as we shall see, to such men as Wellhausen, Kuenen and Colenso. Surely Dr. Driver does not mean to imply that these are not representative critical names! Finally, though Dr. Driver thinks that the higher critics have made ample use of archaeology in their study of the Old Testament, other critics, equally competent, hold different views. Thus, Canon Cheyne says: "I fully admit that until Schrader and Sayce arose, Old Testament critics did not pay much attention to Assyriology" (p. 234). And again, he would have no objection if Professor Sayce had said that "Kuenen, for instance, had not given enough attention to Assyriology, and that Willhausen and Robertson Smith had in former years (like other Semitic scholars) displayed an excessive distrust of that study" (p. 235). It would seem, therefore, that Dr. Driver's criticisms upon Professor Sayce's new work are not always well-founded.

I proceed now to examine some of the results of the study of the monuments of antiquity, as they are set forth in Professor Sayce's latest work, and as they effect the writings of the Old Testament.

A most important consideration, not only in regard to the possibility of the Mosaic authorship, but also from the point of view of the reliability of the Old Testament history, is the date of the introduction of Semitic writing. M. Rénan, in his "*Histoire du Peuple d'Israel*," the last volume of which has only appeared within the last few months, assures us that "hand-writing was unknown in Israel until three or four hundred years after the time of Moses and Joshua. The ages which do not possess hand-writing transmit only fables."† Such an idea has been completely exploded by the revelations of the monuments.

Until quite recently, the opinion of Champollion, adopted by Drummond and Salvolini, and ably developed by De Rougè, Canon Taylor and Lenormant, that the Phœnician alphabet,

* "Founders of Old Testament Criticism," p. 252.

† Vol. I. p. 155, *note*.

from which nearly all existing alphabets have been derived, owed its origin directly to the alphabet of ancient Egypt, was the opinion of almost all scholars. The matter is at present by no means so clear as it was. "The explorations of Dr. Glaser in Southern Arabia have lately put the question in a new and unexpected light" (p. 39). He has re-copied or discovered over a thousand inscriptions in Yemen and Hadhramaut, in two different dialects, one of which is more archaic than the other. It appears that the inscriptions belong to the ancient kingdoms of Ma'in and Saba; and, from the light that Dr. Glaser has thrown on the subject, it seems to be conclusively established that the kingdom of Ma'in had already fallen into decay before the rise of the kingdom of Saba. The kingdom of Saba was itself of great antiquity. In the eighth century B.C., its sway extended to the extreme north of Arabia, and we know from the Old Testament that one of its queens had visited king Solomon two centuries before. Now Ma'in had already enjoyed a long term of existence before the rise of Saba. Indeed, thirty-three of its kings are named in the inscriptions; and it seems to be established, that in the days of the Exodus, the kings of Ma'in ruled Arabia even to the boundaries of Madian and Edom; and that writing was commonly practised in the kingdom.

From these facts a very important conclusion follows. It would seem more likely that the Phœnician alphabet derives its origin from Ma'in, than that the alphabet of Ma'in springs from Phœnicia. And in fact this conclusion is strengthened by a comparison of the two alphabets in the light of the names of the Hebrew characters. For, whilst these names are meaningless, if taken in connection with the earliest forms of the Phœnician letters, they are often explained when brought to bear upon those of Ma'in.

But a still more important conclusion also follows. It becomes impossible any longer to maintain the illiterateness of the Israelites in the time of the Exodus. They had just left a country in which writing and literature had been known for ages; men of their own race, the people of Ma'in, who read and wrote, were constantly passing to and fro through the countries which they occupied; and, finally, at the other end of the desert, were the states of Edom and Madian,

which were in constant communication with the kingdom of Ma'in.*

But, furthermore, there is evidence from the inscriptions to show that "the populations of Western Asia in the age of Moses were as highly cultured and literary as the populations of Western Europe in the age of the Renaissance" (p. 47).

Tel el-amarna is a mound, situated on the Nile, about half-way between the towns of Minieh and Assiout. Here one of the Egyptian kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty, Amenôphis IV., who had changed his name into Khu-n-Aten, having been expelled from Thebes by the influence of the priesthood, built himself a new capital, and deposited in it the official correspondence of his father and himself, which he had taken with him in his flight. At his death his capital fell into decay; and his correspondence lay buried in the ruins of the city, till it was exhumed in the year 1887, forming the collection known as the "Tel el-amarna Tablets." The correspondence is composed of a vast number of letters from persons in every rank of life, on all kinds of subjects, and written from Palestine, Phœnicia, Babylonia and elsewhere. They are written upon clay, in the cuneiform characters of Babylonia. And so long and so thoroughly had this form of writing been adopted, that experts can tell at a glance, by the shape of the characters, whence any particular tablet had come.

Now Khu-n-Aten and his father were both Egyptian kings, who flourished more than a century before the Exodus. Still the Tel el-amarna Tablets are almost all written—not in Egyptian—but in Babylonian. Babylonian, in fact, was evidently the great medium of communication in that age in Western Asia, just as French is now the language of diplomacy. The Babylonian language and still more the Babylonian system of writing were extremely difficult to learn; and yet it is clear that "every one who pretended to the rank and education of a gentleman" (p. 49) was able to correspond in that tongue. "Schools and libraries must have existed everywhere, and the art of writing and reading must have been as widely spread as it was in Europe before the days of the penny post"† (p. 51). In fine, Babylonian culture and

* Cf. Sayce, pp. 37-46.

† Such a library would have existed at Cariath-sepher, "the City of

literature were paramount throughout the whole of Western Asia.

All this has a very important bearing upon the early chapters of the Book of Genesis. The similarity between the subject-matter of these chapters and the ancient Babylonian and Assyrian texts has been long recognised. In fact, in some places, in the accounts of the Creation, the formation of woman, the Garden of Eden, the tree of life, the Flood, the Tower of Babel, and Nimrod, the resemblance is even noticable in the words.

Nor is there any reason why the Catholic interpreter should deny that the author of Genesis had the venerable Babylonian texts before him ; any more than that he should deny that the authors of Judges, Samuel, Kings, or Chronicles made use of fallible written sources ; or that the writer of the second book of Machabees epitomised the five books of Jason of Cyrene (ii. 20) ; or that St. Luke wrote his gospel, according to what he heard from those who "were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" (l. 2). Traces of the primitive tradition, though obscured by a dense cloud of mythology and fable, are doubtless contained in the ancient Babylonian and Assyrian texts. But then the gift of inspiration would have protected the sacred writer from recording in his work anything but what the Holy Spirit desired.

Now the practically unanimous verdict of the higher critics assigns these chapters chiefly to the two-fold prophetic narrative which was combined into one probably in the eighth century B.C., and partly also to the priestly writer, who did not complete his labours till after the Babylonian captivity. And we are asked to believe that it was during his residence in Babylon that the priest-writer became acquainted with the Babylonian accounts of the Creation and the Flood. How the prophetic writers obtained their information, we are not definitely told.

The Tel el-amarna Tablets throw a new light on the matter.

Books" (Judges i. 11) ; called in Joshua (xv. 49) Cariath-senna, "the City of Instruction ;" no doubt because of a famous school there. An indication of the early use of writing occurs in Judges v. 14 (acknowledged by all to be very ancient) ; for Professor Sayce tells us the correct translation is, "Out of Machir came down lawgivers, and out of Zabulon they that handle the pen of the scribe" (p. 56).

We know that the Babylonian texts on primitive history are of great antiquity; the great Chaldæan epic, containing the description of the Flood, being said to have been composed in in the year 2350 B.C. We know, moreover, that Babylonian literature, containing all these ancient traditions, was familiar in Palestine, Egypt, and the neighbouring countries long before the time of Moses. Of course archæology cannot decide when the Bible writer made use of the Babylonian texts; "all it can do is to show that an early date is just as possible as a late one"* (p. 106).

As a result of his study of the higher criticism some few years ago, Professor Mivart tells us that "it is thought to be in the highest degree unlikely that Abraham ever really existed."† And, indeed, Wellhausen says of him that "he might with more likelihood be regarded as a free creation of unconscious art."‡ Such, in fact, is the common view of critics, who regard the name as made up to signify the mythical father of the Hebrew race; Abraham meaning "the father of many peoples." Moreover, notwithstanding Dr. Driver's protest, that it is not correct to state that "it has been a dogma of the 'higher criticism' to reject the historical character" (p. 416) of the expedition described in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, we must say that it certainly has been commonly called in question by that school. Thus, to say nothing of Rénan and others, Canon Cheyne, even after reading Professor Sayce's defence in "Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments," writes: "I am afraid that Professor Sayce's defence of the narrative in Genesis xiv. is not very successful."§

Against all this we may point out that the name Abram, Abu-ramu, "the exalted father," though the name does not refer to the great patriarch himself, has been found among early Babylonian contracts (p. 159). Moreover, the idea that the Elamite campaign mentioned in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis is a mere reflection of such campaigns as those of Sennacherib into patriarchal times, is now known to be without foundation. Babylonian or Elamite invasions of Palestine

* Cf. Sayce, pp. 46-158.

† *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1887, p. 41.

‡ Prolegomena, p. 320.

§ "Founders of Old Testament Criticism," p. 239.

before the Exodus are not only credible but matters of history. We read in the inscriptions that, 3800 years B.C., Sargon of Accad had pushed his victories even to the Mediterranean, and that Ammi-Satana, King of Babylon (2241-2216, B.C.), included Syria and Palestine in his empire. Moreover, a prince named Eri-Aku tells us that his father, Kudur-Mabug, was "father of the land of the Amorites"* in the age of Abraham; and this Kadur-Mabug has a name formed in precisely the same way as the Chedor-Laomer (Kudur-Lagamar) of Genesis xiv. So that Genesis xiv. and the inscriptions are in perfect accord. "In both we find Baby^{lon} divided into more than one kingdom; in both it is under the suzerainty of Elam; in both its princes claim dominion in the ancient West. But the parallelism extends even further than this. The King of Elam bears a name so analogous to that of the father of Eri-Aku as to suggest that they belonged to the same family, while Eri-Aku of Larsa irresistibly reminds us of Arioch of Ellasar" (p. 165).

We have, moreover, confirmatory evidence respecting the incident of Melchizedech, mentioned in the same chapter of Genesis. Jerusalem is written in the inscriptions Uru-'salim,† 'Salim being the god of. "peace." There is, among the Tel el-amarna tablets, a letter from a certain Ebed-tob, vassal-king of Jerusalem, in which he tells the Pharaoh that he holds his office, not from him, but from "the great king," that is, the god of the city. He was, in fact, "King of Salem" and "priest of the most high god." For the office of priest-king was most common in those early times. The position of Ebed-tob was that of Melchizedech, and fits in exactly with what is said of him in Genesis xiv.‡

From what we have said of the general diffusion of knowledge in early times, and the constant intercourse between Ma'in and Edom, it seems certain that the use of writing must have prevailed in Edom at a very early date. The list of kings of Edom, contained in Genesis xxxvi., certainly points to that conclusion. For there was no reason why the writer of Genesis should have evolved such a list from his inner con-

* This country included Palestine in those days.

† Uru—city. So the word means "City of the God of Peace."

‡ Sayce, pp. 174, *et seq.*

sciousness. And it is natural to suppose that the names were taken from the printed records of Edom. Professor Sayce suggests the possible presence of two other specimens of Edomite literature in the Bible. One of these is the Book of Job, the scene of which is laid in the land of Us, not far from the Edomite border. Perhaps the corruption and difficulty of the text arises from the fact of its having been written originally in a different dialect from Hebrew, and having afterwards "passed through the hands of Jewish editors" (pp. 207, 480). The other is the collection of proverbs, which begins (Proverbs xxxi. 1) with the words: "The proverbs of Lemuel, King of Massa, which his mother taught him." This suggestion is based on the supposition, which seems to be borne out by the monuments, that Massa was close to the borders of Edom.*

The Egyptian element in the Hexateuch comprises those chapters which deal with the history of Joseph, the sojourn in Egypt, and the Exodus. Professor Sayce tells us that "the Egyptian colouring given to the history of Joseph is too vivid and clear to admit of question" (p. 208). And again: "It is in accordance with the general facts of Egyptian history; while, in matters of detail . . . it displays a striking accuracy" (p. 230). Dr. Driver is largely of the same opinion, for, while observing that the Pentateuch "is deficient in local *details*" (p. 418), he admits that the "Egyptian colouring of these narratives undoubtedly tends to confirm their general credibility" (*ibid*). In fact, just such a position as was bestowed upon Joseph, we know to have been entrusted to a certain Dudu, who was also a native of Canaan, in the reign of Khu-n-Aten.† Parallels have been found to the seven years of scarcity; and we know that the changes said to have been introduced by Joseph in the land tenure of Egypt,‡ are quite in harmony with Egyptian history. Finally, there exists a romance, called "The Story of Two Brothers," belonging to the time of Seti II., and coinciding so nearly with the facts narrated of Joseph in Genesis xxxix., that one is irresistibly led to the conclusion that the story is

* Sayce, pp. 207, 479, 480.

† "Records of the Past," iii. 67-70.

‡ Gen. xlvii. 20-26.

founded on the history of Joseph's experience with Putiphar's wife.

Kuenen says of the Exodus that it is "utterly unhistorical."* And, strange to say, he is led to this conclusion not because of the miracles recorded, but chiefly owing to what he regards as the absurdity of the numbers. Would he, on the same principle, entirely reject Herodotus' picture of the Persian wars, because of the incredible magnitude he assigns to Xerxes' army? Surely, in both cases, at most he can only conclude the exaggeration of the numbers. At all events, archæology does not bear out Kuenen's opinion as to the Exodus. On the contrary, the Mosaic narrative receives fresh confirmation every day.

The land of Goshen has "ceased to be the property of fanciful theorists, and has passed into the possession of the scientific map-maker."† It was, in fact, the Phakusa of classical geographers, and was situated at modern Saft el-Heuneh. Ramses II., the founder of the Nineteenth Dynasty, who reigned sixty-seven years, and died in 1281 B.C., was, without doubt, the Pharaoh of the oppression. For we know that in his time Canaan was not yet Israelite, since his armies constantly marched through it against the Hittites. We know, too, that he rose up against the Semitic foreigners in the land, enslaved them, and forced them to labour at his buildings. For "Ramses II. was emphatically the building Pharaoh of Egypt."‡ Ramses and Pithom were the fruit of their toil (Ex. i. 11); Ramses, whose very name tells of its founder, and which was near Goshen; and Pithom, called Pi-tum or Thuku (the Succoth of Ex. xiii. 37), which is known also to owe its origin to Ramses II., and which was situated at the modern Tel el-Maskhutih.

If Ramses was the Pharaoh of the oppression, it is equally certain that his son Menephtah II. was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. And, indeed, there exists an Egyptian tradition, taken by Josephus from the historian Manetho, which seems to assign the Exodus to that reign, and even mentions in connection with it the name of Moses.§

* Hexateuch, p. 42.

† Sayce, p. 234.

‡ Sayce, p. 239.

§ Josephus, "C. Apionem," i. 26.

With regard to the route followed by the Israelites in their departure out of Egypt, Professor Sayce writes as follows :*

The excavations and researches of recent years have at last begun to throw light on this perplexing question. Little by little we have recovered the geography of the Delta in the age of Moses, and are at last beginning to trace the march of the Hebrews in their flight from Egypt. It is true many points still remain doubtful, and upon these discussion is still possible ; but more points have been finally cleared up, and the main outlines of the map of the Delta can now be filled in.

Archæology, for instance, has enabled us to explain the visit of Jethro, priest of Madian, to his kinsman Moses whilst he was in the wilderness of Sinai.† For, on independent grounds, it tells us that Sinai was really in the district of Seir, and so, close to Madian. On the subject of the position of Sinai Wellhausen gives us a good instance of his desire to profit by archæology. “ We do not know,” he says,‡ “ where Sinai was situated. . . . Only dilettanti care much for controversy on the matter.”

We cannot at present throw much light upon the conquest of Canaan and the period of the Judges. That will come when the buried cities of Palestine have been explored and their libraries exhumed. The labours of Professor Petrie and Mr. Bliss, however, have not left us entirely in the dark. The site of Lachish, mentioned in Joshua (x.), has been discovered at Tell el-Hesi ; and we have learnt from its ruins the vast age of the cities of Canaan, and the immense strength of their walls.§ Moreover, we are not without an explanation how the Israelites could have prevailed against such powerful foes. From an inscription of the Pharaoh Ramses III. (c. 1210) at Medinet Habu, we know that a powerful invasion from the north had descended upon and weakened the Hittites and Amorites at the very time of the Israelite invasion.||

In the Book of Judges (iii.) it is said that Othniel delivered Israel from Chusan-Rasathaim, King of Mesopotamia, into whose hands it had been delivered for eight years. Wellhausen refers to this episode as a kind of standard

* P. 250.

† Ex. xviii.

‡ Prolegomena, p. 344, *note*.

§ The walls of Lachish were 28 ft. 6 in. thick.

|| Sayce, p. 299.

apochryphal story,* but nevertheless it has received confirmation from the inscriptions. The invasion of Canaan from the north was really undertaken with a view to an ultimate attack upon Egypt. Among the allied nations was Aram-Naharaim or Mitanni; but when the other princes marched with their troops into Egypt the King of Aram-Naharaim† remained behind in Canaan. It was then that "Israel served the King of Mesopotamia." Ramses III. was Pharaoh of Egypt, and proved victorious over the invaders. He followed up his victory into Palestine, and, doubtless in alliance with Othoniel, put an end to the tyranny of the King of Mitanni. All this fits in admirably with the history of the Book of Judges.‡

The main outlines of the history of Israel from the time of David is not called in question by critics; neither is the fact that writing was practised in Israel during the period of the kings.§ The discovery of the Moabite stone (c. 850 B.C.) and of the Siloam inscription|| has removed all doubt on that subject. It is but natural to suppose therefore—and, indeed, it is admitted by all—that the writer of the Books of Kings drew his materials from written sources, sometimes the Assyrian and other inscriptions, at other times the authorities mentioned in his work. The accuracy with which he does so is well illustrated by an inscription which has recently been found at Singerli, near Antioch, from which it would seem that the spelling of the documents was followed even where, as in this case, inaccurate.¶

Dr. Driver finds nothing "which is in conflict with the conclusions of modern critics" in Professor Sayce's views on the Books of Kings (p. 421). That is satisfactory, for Professor Sayce tells us that "we can accept without hesitation the history contained in the Books of Kings, even in its details" (p. 447). It is true he restricts this statement in some degree. Thus, he says: "The chronological framework of the history must be laid aside as artificial and misleading;" and "we meet from time to time with statements which imply

* Prolegomena, p. 207.

† Called in the Vulgate "the King of Mesopotamia."

‡ Sayce, pp. 296-305.

§ Driver, l. c., p. 421.

|| Belongs to the end of the eighth century B.C.

¶ Sayce, p. 413.

a defective knowledge of the facts." It must, however, be borne in mind that Catholic interpreters have long recognised the presence of chronological errors in the text; and, then, we do not know that in every case the sacred writer meant to give any more than an approximate date. To take an instance, Wellhausen asserts that the chronology of the historical books is artificial; his chief argument being the constant recurrence of the number 40.* And, indeed, that number appears so often that one would naturally be disposed to attribute its use to something more than mere chance. Professor Sayce, however, assures us, and he is borne out by the Moabite stone, that the period of forty years is, "in Hebrew idiom, an indefinite period, the real length of which was unknown to the author," (p. 375); just as in Greek the word *μυρίοι* was used to express a number indefinitely great.

The class of statements alluded to, "implying a defective knowledge of the facts," are not of a very alarming kind. We give two specimens. The King of Damascus, called Benhadad in 3 Kings xx., is named Hadad-idri on the monolith of Shalmaneser II., found at Kurkh in Armenia.† Another such error is supposed to occur in 4 Kings xvii. 4, where So, Sua or Seve is called "King of Egypt." In a text of Sargon, belonging to this period, a certain Sab'e, distinguished from the Pharaoh, is referred to as commander-in-chief of Egypt. The writer of Kings is said to have confounded this Sab'e with the Pharaoh.‡

Of the Books of Chronicles, Professor Mivart tells us that, in the eyes of critics, they are "considered as thoroughly unhistorical," "being habitually falsified."§ Wellhausen will only admit that "it is possible a grain of good corn may occur among the chaff."|| Colenso concludes that "the Chronicler's statements, when not supported by other evidence, are *not certainly to be relied on*."¶ Finally, Wellhausen lays down that the sources of the Books of Chronicles are merely the older historical books.**

Professor Sayce, relying on the verdict of the monuments,

* Prolegomena, p. 272, *et seq.*

† Hadad and his son Ben-hadad were both gods, worshipped at Damascus.

‡ It is not clear that So of Chronicles is not intended for Schabak, the Pharaoh. In any case, Sab'e was clearly practically "King of Egypt," as far as the Israelites were concerned.

§ *Loc. cit.*, p. 41.

|| Prolegomena, p. 224.

¶ Pentateuch, p. 97.

** *Loc. cit.*, pp. 171-227.

takes a different view of the matter; and in this he has the support of Dr. Driver (p. 424). A large part of the history of Chronicles is identical with that of Kings; enough has been said on that portion already. As to those narratives which are found in Chronicles, and of which there are no traces in the Books of Kings, Professor Sayce tells us that we may assume them to be in accordance with historical facts (p. 461). Even where the chronicler, in recording the same events as are to be found in the Books of Kings, mentions places and peoples omitted in the latter, the additions are to be considered as worthy of credit (pp. 467, 468). In fact, such passages as that recounting the captivity and subsequent restoration of King Manasses (2 Ch. xxxiii.), and that in which the campaign of Zerah against Judah—characterised as “apochryphal” by Wellhausen*—is described, have been shown to be in conformity with history. From all this it follows that “the chronicler was not confined to the Books of Kings and the writings of the canonical prophets for the sources of his history.”†

Still, it must be added that Professor Sayce does not vindicate the accuracy of the Books of Chronicles in full. The most we can say is that already the inscriptions have materially modified the incredulity of critics regarding these books. Professor Sayce, however, lays down that the chronicler’s “statements are not always exact,” and that “his use of the documents which lay before him was uncritical” (p. 462). Still, when we come to examine into the actual objections raised against the reliability of the chronicler, they turn out to be mostly of a very trivial character, and such as do not present any great difficulty.‡ The most serious is certainly the charge of consistent exaggeration in numbers (p. 463). It must not be imagined, however, that anyone defends the numbers of Chronicles as they now stand. Indeed, it seems to us that modern critics do not take sufficiently into account the corrupt state of the text of these books. For, as Davidson says:§ “The text is more corrupt than that of any other sacred book.” Surely critics who regard the older historical books as the only

* *Loc. cit.*, p. 207.

† Sayce, p. 461.

‡ Such is the objection that Pul and Tiglathpilneser are spoken of as distinct persons (1 Ch. v. 26).

§ “Introduction to the Old Testament,” vol. ii. p. 108.

sources of the Books of Chronicles, must explain, in this way, discrepancies between numbers occurring in Chronicles and corresponding numbers in the other books of the Old Testament, especially in cases where the chronicler does not exaggerate but diminish numbers.*

The Book of Esdras-Nehemias Professor Sayce attributes to the same author as the Books of Chronicles (p. 538); and he considers "the history of the return from the exile, and the events which immediately followed it," to have been taken from an Aramaic chronicle, and to be of "high value." He points out what he considers "chronological inconsistencies" (548) in other parts of the book, and assigns the date of the whole work to a time certainly not earlier than the high-priesthood of Jaddua (B.C. 351-331).

Archæology has done a great deal towards vindicating the early date of the Canticle of Canticles. It is true Hebraists are still inclined to favour its North Israelite origin, but we have every reason to be satisfied with the progress that has already been made towards establishing the Solomonian authorship. A few years ago we were told that on account of linguistic characteristics the Canticle must be assigned to the epoch of Alexander the Great and his successors. Now the language of critics is modified, and Canon Cheyne can only say that "all the facts as yet elicited by exegesis can be explained quite as well on the assumption of a late date as of an early one."† Three words, occurring in the Canticle, were largely responsible for the conclusion of critics as to its date—viz., *appiryon*, "a litter" (iii. 9), which was said to be from the Greek *φορείον*; *parde's*, "a garden" (iv. 13), associated with the Greek *παράδεισος*; and the Hebrew particle *shel* (iii. 7), said to be used only in late writings. Assyriologists have, however, discovered the Assyrian equivalent of *appiryon*, "*aparne*," among the Cappadocian cuneiform tablets. These inscriptions, which are memorials of an Assyrian colony once settled in Cappadocia, are of great antiquity, probably belonging to the fifteenth century B.C. *Parde's* is in all probability a corruption for *pare's*, from the Assyrian *pir'su*. As for the

* Cf. 1 Ch. ii. 23; Judges x. 4; 1 Ch. xi. 11; 2 Sam. xxii. 8; 1 Ch. xxi. 12; 2 Sam. xxiv. 3, &c.

† "Founders of Old Testament Criticism," p. 352.

particle *shel*, by a lucky chance, a stone weight has been found on the site of Samaria, belonging to the eighth century B.C., containing the identical word.* All this is very important, not merely as exploding the old arguments for the late date of the Canticle of Canticles, but because it shows how insecure is the foundation on which the literary analysis of the historical books of the Old Testament is built.

Professor Sayce comes to the conclusion that Esther, Judith, Tobias, Jonas, and, to a certain extent, the Books of Chronicles are specimens of Jewish haggadah. We have already expressed our opinion as to the possibility of the presence of such literature among the Sacred Books. It may, however, be added here that a learned writer of unquestioned orthodoxy, Father Cornely, is of opinion that the Books of Chronicles are not in the strict sense historical. By this we do not mean that he admits of errors in these books; but that he maintains the primary object of the writer to have been, not to write history, but to exhort his countrymen to the faithful observance of the Law, and due celebration of Divine worship. This he does by setting before them the history of the ancient kingdom, choosing certain facts "by which he might teach his countrymen how greatly the accurate observance of the Law and the legitimate worship of God tended to the prosperity of the kingdom."†

The last book of which we have to speak is the prophecy of Daniel; and here, we regret to say, Professor Sayce has gone over, bag and baggage, to the views of the higher critics. Not only does he maintain that Daniel was written in an age "later than that of Alexander the Great" (p. 535), but he entirely denies the historical value of the book (p. 532). Specimens of the errors contained in it are the following: "Belshazzar, and not Nabonidos, is said to be the last 'King of the Chaldeans,' and his successor is called 'Darius the Mede'" (p. 525). "The Biblical story implies that Babylon was taken by storm; at all events, it expressly states that 'the King of the Chaldeans was slain'" (p. 526). Finally, Belshazzar is said to have been the son of Nebuchadnezzar (*ibid.*) A discussion as

* Cf. Sayce, pp. 449, 491, 492. An attempt has been made by Robertson Smith to show that *shel* on the weight is not the particle *shel*, but another word. Cf. *Academy*, Nov. 18, 1893.

† Introduction, vol. ii. (1), p. 336.

to the reliability of the history contained in the Book of Daniel would be out of place in this paper. We shall therefore content ourselves with two remarks for the guidance of the reader, on the position taken up by Professor Sayce: (1) It seems to us a pity that Professor Sayce does not, in conformity with the advice he so often inculcates in the course of his work, exercise more reserve as to what the monuments may still have in store for us respecting the history of Daniel. Dr. Driver is far more careful, and says in one place: * "The circumstances are not inconsistent with the existence of 'Darius the Mede,' and a cautious criticism will not build too much on the silence of the monuments." (2) The second remark we make is, that Mr. Pinches, of the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum, who, in 1880, first brought to light one of the two tablets, on which Professor Sayce chiefly relies for his adverse views on the Book of Daniel, does not think the facts it contains inconsistent with the traditional view on the book.† In his paper on the subject at the Church Congress 1891,‡ he shows that Belshazzar was "in a great measure endowed with royal powers"; that he "was practically king when Babylon was taken"; that he "was killed during the night"; that "the city was taken by Gobryas"; and that "Gobryas appointed governors in Babylon." If we suppose Gobryas and Darius the Mede to have been the same person, we reconcile in many points the history of Daniel and of the ancient monuments. In fact, as Mr. Pinches says: "The Book of Daniel is not by any means so unreconcilable as has during late years been supposed" (*loc. cit.*).

We have now finished our examination of Professor Sayce's latest work. We do not say that it is altogether satisfactory from a Catholic standpoint. Far from it. But we *do* say that it shows that archæology is on the side of the Bible against destructive criticism. We claim that it shows that the light thrown upon the Old Testament by the inscriptions has already compelled the critics to retire from many a position hostile to orthodox interpretation; and that it gives us reason to expect that archæology will, in the future, still further vindicate the

* "Literature of the Old Testament," p. 469.

† The same applies to Mr. Flinders Petrie.

‡ *Times*, Oct. 8, 1891.

teaching of the Church on the inspiration of Sacred Scripture.

Two short quotations place us in possession of Professor Sayce's opinion as to the light archæology has thrown upon the Old Testament: "We cannot fail to be struck by the fact," he says (p. 561), "that the evidence of oriental archæology is on the whole distinctly unfavourable to the pretensions of the 'higher criticism.' The 'apologist' may lose something, but the 'higher critic' loses much more." And again: "The critic had resolved the narratives of Genesis into a series of myths and idealistic fictions; the Assyriologist has rescued some at least of them for the historian of the past. With this result let us be content" (p. 173). No! We are not content. Professor Sayce's position and ours are totally different. He has done a service to the Church in, as he himself expresses it, "taking stock of" the archæological knowledge we have already acquired. But then he is a believer in what Professor Huxley terms "inspiration with limited liability"; the Church teaches "plenary inspiration." He is satisfied with the partial vindication of the Old Testament; we look for its complete victory over destructive criticism.

And we are the more confident of final triumph because we know that, whilst the Church is opposed to the loose systems of inspiration which find favour in these days, She has never committed herself to the narrow theories of verbal inspiration, which were in vogue with the early reformers of the sixteenth century. *Virtus in medio stat.* The Church has always favoured a reverent, and yet broad and liberal teaching on this subject; and in such teaching we may confidently expect her to persevere.

J. A. HOWLETT.

ART. V.—THE VIVISECTION CONTROVERSY.

Our Secret Friends and Foes. By PERCY J. FRANKLAND.
London. 1893.

Animals' Rights considered in Relation to Social Progress. By
HENRY S. SALT, author of "The Life of David Thoreau,"
&c. London. 1893.

THE first of these two books is valuable both on account of its treatment of the subject directly indicated on its title-page, and because of the information it copiously supplies on the practical utility of physiological experiment. The second takes the opposite side, and vehemently protests against this (as Mr. Salt calls it) "experimental torture." It is valuable not only on account of its vigorous presentment of the other side of the question, but also because of the consistency with which it attacks sport, the slaughter of animals for food, and other cognate practices. The whole question has of late years been attracting considerable attention, not only among the general public, but also—as is shown by recent discussions in the *Tablet*, the *Catholic Times*, the *Month*, and elsewhere—in Catholic circles. In here offering on it some (it is to be hoped) dispassionate observations, the most orderly plan will be to begin by stating what is intended by vivisection, and what is the *punctum difficultatis* respecting it.

Being derived from *vivum*, a living being, and *sectio*, a cutting, "vivisection" etymologically means the performance of a surgical operation on a living creature by the use of a cutting instrument. But by common consent, it is on the one hand restricted to operations on beings which, unlike plants, and, probably, some of the lower animals, are capable of feeling pain, and is on the other hand extended to all operations analogous to those performed by the use of cutting instruments, whatever the nature of the agent may be—whether it is a needle, a hypodermic syringe, a pole-axe, heat, cold, electricity, a chemical compound, a disease-germ, or anything else. Further, it is not employed with reference to

operations—in this wide sense of “operation,” in which the administration of an electric shock may be said to be one—undertaken for the advantage or with the consent of the living being on whom, or on which, they are performed. To trephine the skull of a patient who was insensible on account of the pressure exercised on the brain by a tumour or a fragment of broken bone, would not be denominated vivisection if it were done for the patient’s benefit and not merely to ascertain whether such an operation could be successfully carried out, though from the nature of the case he could not give his consent; and as little would the hypodermic injection of a new drug under the skin of a medical student who understood and agreed to what was being done, receive the name of vivisection, even though the drug were administered solely to ascertain the nature of its physiological effects with greater exactitude than was already known.* But from the narrowness of their mental faculties, the lower animals are incapable of according “consent” (even in the loosest meaning of that term) on anything but the most simple matters,† while they are continually being employed in the service of other beings without any compensating advantage to themselves. The term vivisection is therefore chiefly, and indeed almost exclusively, applied to operative procedures on them, without the consent of the animal operated on, and not for its individual benefit or advantage. It is used in regard of operations (in the wide sense of operation already indicated) carried out for the purpose of augmenting human knowledge,

* In this last case, however, the question is, as often happens, one of degree. The term “vivisection” would probably be applied to it if great and prolonged suffering were incurred. And the consent, it will be noticed, does not essentially alter the moral aspect of the subject. There are innumerable actions which it is wrong to perform, even with the consent of the person concerned, *e.g.*, murder.

† They are, for the same reason, incapable of *dissent* with respect to actions which are at all complicated, *i.e.*, to acts of which the relevant consequences are multitudinous or remote. Being unable to take into account the action as a whole, they are incompetent to say either “Yes” or “No” to it. To take as an example a hard case for the lower animals, it is impossible even to propose to a rabbit such a question as, “Will you be inoculated with rabies in order that your spinal cord may be used for the preparation of anti-rabic hypodermic injections?”—much less to discuss the bearings of the subject, and obtain an intelligent adhesion or refusal. The introduction, by anti-vivisectionists, of *consent* as a factor in the discussion, is consequently misleading.

of confirming what is already known, or of acquiring dexterity in operative surgery.*

Opposite opinions have been expressed on the usefulness of such experiments; from which the reader is fairly entitled to draw the conclusion that some have been useful, and others not. Some, indeed, appear to have been performed in a spirit of simple perversity. But though it is a common experience that the utility of an addition to human knowledge does not come out for many, perhaps for many hundreds of, years—as the investigations of the Greek geometers into the properties of the ellipse become useful only after Newton had rendered it possible to use their results in navigation—the authority of the great majority of those qualified to judge is strongly in favour of “vivisection.” Many years ago the British Association for the Advancement of Science expressed itself in its favour. The British Medical Association passed a resolution in the same sense on July 29, 1892, at a general meeting attended also by the members of the Council; and very impressively wrote Sir Andrew Clark, Sir James Paget, Dr. Samuel Wilkes, and Sir George Humphrey to the *Times* in course of a controversy on the subject, “It is hardly possible for us to name any progress of importance in medicine, surgery, or midwifery, which has not been due to, or promoted by, this method of inquiry.” Indeed, it would never have been seriously objected to were it not for the infliction of pain—and in some cases, unquestionably, of severe pain—which it involves. The animal may be etherised or chloroformed, or curare—the effect of which is more prolonged—may be administered to it. An etherised or chloroformed animal, killed by an extra dose of the anæsthetic before returning to consciousness, suffers no pain or other inconvenience except that of having the chloroform or ether administered to it; which may be reduced to a minimum. A frog chloroformed

* For instance, in ligaturing arteries or suturing gastric ulcers in such a way that the contents of the digestive organs will not afterwards enter the cavity of the peritoneum. The human knowledge referred to may be information with respect to the precise nature, and consequently the proper treatment, of a particular case, *e.g.*, ascertaining whether a child is suffering from diphtheria, by “cultivating” in the mouth of a guinea pig a fragment of the suspicious exudation on its fauces; or determining in an analogous way whether a dog, supposed to be mad, by which human beings had been bitten, was in reality rabid.

by immersion and hypodermic injection, on the web of whose hind foot the circulation of the blood and the initial phenomena of inflammation are shown, feels no pain whatever; and those who see whatever of physiological phenomena can reasonably be shown them, are *cæteris paribus* more likely to be interested in their work, to make progress with their studies, and to become good and useful practitioners of the healing art. But though it is always easier to perform a manual operation on an insensible and therefore motionless animal, there are cases (as, operations on the nervous system, to investigate facts of sensation) where insensibility has to be brought to an end toward the close of the operation, though it may not be totally brought to an end, or morphine or some other sedative may be employed to dull the pain.*

And, again, though the operation itself may be performed from first to last under the influence of an anæsthetic, its very purpose may be to inoculate with the bacilli of tubercle or of some other malady, or to produce some other abnormal and more or less painful state in the animal, which is then allowed to live for a sufficient time for the results to be investigated. In this way Koch proved the *Bacillus tuberculosis* to be the cause of tubercular disease.—These are the general features of the method. To enter into details and select examples would be the method of a dishonest advocate on the one side or on the other; for, as all the world is aware, anything can by that method be made to appear proved, without the slightest real progress in the intelligent presentment of the subject having been made.

The *punctum difficultatis* is, then, whether it is morally right to give pain without the consent of the creature on which the suffering is inflicted, and is inflicted neither as a punishment nor for its individual advantage. This is equivalent to the companion question, whether under the same circumstances it is allowable to deprive of pleasure; for the privation of a pleasure is, obviously, morally equivalent to the infliction of pain. All sentient creatures are engaged for a considerable part of their lives in balancing, by instinct or by reason, pains and pleasures one against the other, with

* Contrary to what is popularly supposed, a full dose of curare destroys sensibility. See Victor Horsley, in the *Rock*, Jan. 6, 1893.

the result that they bear the pain because of the pleasure, or forego the pleasure because of the pain. But it is not equivalent to the question whether we may do evil that good may come, because pleasure and pain are not good and evil in the *moral* sense of the words good and evil.

New human beings are continually coming into the world, and an essayist can scarcely make a greater mistake than to take for granted that every one who reads what he writes is acquainted with the subject beforehand. Let it therefore be briefly explained that the term Good (and, by parity, the contrary term Evil) has two meanings, which are linked together by what is "good" in either sense being an object to be desired. The two kinds of good are, in the phraseology of the scholastics, the *bonum delectabile*, or pleasure, and the *bonum honestum*, or what is right; and with these are contrasted respectively the *malum afflictivum*, pain, and the *malum inhonestum*, wickedness, sin or moral evil in its various kinds and degrees. That the lower and the higher sense differ *toto cælo* is as obvious as anything can well be. To be pleasurable or painful is a quality of feelings, which are in many cases not under our own control, and the apprehension of which requires no intellectual faculty. To be morally praiseworthy or culpable is a property of actions freely and more or less deliberately performed by intelligent beings which know and advert to the part of the moral law that is relevant to the actions they are performing.* The pain of a broken leg is

* Moral good and evil are not, of course, here taken (as, on account of the softness of the modern world, is so often done) as identical with kindness and asperity, but include, respectively, justice and every other virtue, and injustice—whether in the direction of being unjustly kind or in that of being unjustly the reverse—and every other vice. What is primarily and essentially good is right action. Other things are called morally good in reference to this. One who was asleep would be called good, if he had performed right actions and had not retracted them; or might be called good by anticipation, if his natural disposition was such that right actions might reasonably be expected of him: though, evidently, he would be morally praiseworthy or meritorious only when, by his reason and free will, he proceeded to act rightly. Indeed, he would be more praiseworthy if he acted rightly *in spite of* his natural disposition. And in the action, what is primarily and essentially good is the act of the will, of which right speech and right deeds are only the carrying out. "There is nothing in the world," says Immanuel Kant—who is here quoted because he presents the subject nakedly and by itself, without introducing extraneous considerations—"which can be termed absolutely and altogether good, a good will only excepted. Intellectual endowments, wit, and extent of fancy, as also courage, determination, and constancy in adhering to purposes once formed, are undeniably good in many

“bad,” and so is a bad egg or a rotten apple. But they are bad in a sense so widely different from that in which a sin is so, that, except as to the one point that they are things to avoid, there can scarcely be any comparison between them. And similarly of pleasure and what is morally right. An agreeable odour is good, and so is a good action; but no number or intensity of agreeable odours, for however great a time their enjoyment was prolonged, could ever be equivalent to the goodness of the most minutely good action that ever was performed. Pain, therefore, and moral evil being two entirely distinct things, to cause the first is not necessarily or by the nature of the case to be the author of the second; and need not be so unless the pain is indirectly a cause of moral evil, or unless there is devastation of the creation of God, or cruelty in its infliction.

Postponing for the moment the topics of devastating God's creation, and the detestable sin of cruelty, the infliction of suffering may be indirectly the cause of moral evil in two ways: by brutalising the author and the spectators (if there are any) of the suffering, and producing the same effect, though, it may be, in a very minor degree, on those who afterwards hear or read of it; and by leading to wrongdoing on the part of those who are made to suffer; for, as a common saying has it, “Oppression maketh” even “a wise man mad.” The *first* of these two reasons obtains with respect to the causation of pain among the brute creation as well as among men, though it does not hold to the same extent. And only *brutal* infliction of pain can (as far as pain-infliction is con

points of view; but they are so far from being absolutely good, that they are qualities capable of being rendered bad and hurtful, when the will, under whose control they stand, is not good in itself. . . . A good will is esteemed to be so, not by the effects which it produces, but by its mere good volition, *i.e.*, it is good in itself, and is, therefore, to be prized incomparably higher for its own sake than anything whatsoever which can be produced at the call of appetite or of inclination. Even if it should happen that, owing to an unhappy conjuncture of events, this good will were deprived of power to execute its benign intent, still this good will (by which is not meant a wish) would, like a diamond, shine in itself, and by virtue of its native lustre. Utility or usefulness could neither enhance nor prejudice this internal splendour; they resemble the setting of a gem, whereby the brilliant is more easily taken in the hand and offered to the attention of those not otherwise judges, but which would not be required by any skilled lapidary to enable him to form his opinion of its worth.”—“Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Ethics,” *in initio* (Semple's Translation. Edinburgh, 1871).

cerned, for, of course, there are many other ways with which we have nothing to do in which brutality may be occasioned) generate or nourish a habit of brutalism. But according to the practically uniform teaching of Catholic theologians, the *second* reason is inapplicable to the pains of the beasts, because the lower animals have no moral nature, and consequently no immortality. It is only on a superficial view that their minds seem like ours, and the high probability—indeed, the practical certainty—is that, necessarily explaining all other minds by our own (of the operations of which alone we are immediately conscious), we much exaggerate the partial and imperfect resemblance which exists. Our interpretations of other beings are drawn, remarks St. Thomas of Aquin, from what is observable in ourselves, with the inevitable result that—estimating what takes place elsewhere by what goes on in our own consciousness—we depress what is higher, and raise what is lower, than our own level. Hence, indeed, Fetichism.—Such is the generalising (or if it may be so called) the metaphysical side of the investigation of the animal consciousness. The experimental side of the investigation has scarcely advanced beyond the anecdotal stage. From this it ensues that (conformably with the most just observation of the Angelic Doctor just referred to) there are innumerable anecdotes of the cleverness of animals. The anecdotes relate, for obvious reasons, principally to animals which have been in intimate association with man; and for an animal to be intimately associated with man is like a man being admitted to the (as it were) visible companionship and the confidence of a superior angel. The mental calibre of dogs, wolves, or other species is to be estimated by what they are equal to when they are among themselves; by averaging the stupid animals (whose doings no anecdotist thinks it worth while to chronicle) along with the clever ones; and by taking, not exceptional actions, but the general course and run of their existence. Even then, that fallacy of observation cannot be altogether escaped which has originated such sayings as, “Fortune favours fools,” and “God protects fou folk and bairns.” The general impression conveyed by the whole of the instances will still be affected by our being more interested in and more likely to remember striking and excep-

tional cases. But at least an able wild dog will be compared with an able man, and an extraordinarily talented cat or pig with Newton, for instance, or with Socrates; while a dog, of which the most remarkable thing that can be said is that it could turn a handle, ring a bell, or count five, or that it showed surprise at seeing a picture, will be compared with a human being whose greatest mental achievements were of only the same kind. That there is in the lower animals, or at least in all of them but the lowest, something which may generically be called mind, and even intelligence, is so obvious that it has been denied only by some Cartesian philosophers, and, as Lactantius says, *Nihil est tam absurdum quod non dictum fuerit ab aliquo philosopho*. Without having been a dog, it is impossible to say exactly and certainly what goes on in a dog's mind. But from the similarity in the construction of the organs of sense it may be taken as practically certain that, in general terms, the sensations are similar in ourselves and in other vertebrates, though even here such examples as that of colour-blindness show that with sense organs indistinguishably alike marked differences between sensations may co-exist. In the higher animals, at all events, the sensations of bodily pleasure and pain are presumably not very different from what they would have been in ourselves had we and our ancestors led the kind of life that is lived by brutes, though the intensity of pain cannot of course be accurately judged of by the vehemence, much less by the "humanness"* with which

* According to the peripatetic and scholastic philosophy, as well as according to physiology, sensations are conjoined with and dependent on the bodily organism. The greatness of a pain is correlative with the delicacy of the nervous system in general; in particular, in regard of that kind of pain; with the intercommunication between its different parts; and with the amount of nervous matter involved. It is not, therefore, scientifically true to say that the beetle which we tread upon feels as much pain as when a giant dies. The few grains of nervous matter in a beetle cannot afford the material concomitant for as much pain as the four pounds or so in the body of a giant. The weight of the normal human brain ranges from about two pounds to about four, three pounds being taken as the average. This is between a thirtieth and a fortieth of the average body-weight. Small animals have heavier brains for their size than more bulky animals (and also have larger eyes); thus, in a blue-headed tit the proportion of brain-weight to body-weight is given as 1 to 12, and in a Greenland whale as 1 to 300 (Bastian, "The Brain as an Organ of Mind." London. 1880. P. 259). Taking as examples more familiar animals, it is given by Bastian as 1:400 in the horse; 1:350, or one-tenth that of man, in the sheep; 1:305 in the dog; 1:156 in the cat, a smaller animal than the dog, and *à fortiori* than man; 1:140 in the rabbit; and 1:76 in the mouse. It is not, however, to be supposed that the whole of the brain

it is expressed; and though in the lowest animal species it cannot be proved that there is any sensation or consciousness whatever. When we attempt to penetrate more deeply into the animal consciousness, and to go from the external sensations to the inner life of sense-imagination, remembrance, and anticipation, the details necessarily become more obscure. But it is evident that correspondence to these mental phenomena exist in the higher among them, and it is also evident that something which corresponds to hope, something which corresponds to fear—and so of anger, of sorrow, of gratitude, and of love. Our explanation—an explanation which, as has been seen above, probably errs greatly on the side of exaggeration—has to be taken from ourselves. And in ourselves, none of these are in themselves moral affections, though they go to the

of any animal is occupied with the elaboration of the material changes which are concomitant on sensations, or, more generally, on feelings. The production of unconscious organic changes and of movements (the motor nerves being given off by the brain directly or indirectly through the spinal chord) has also to be provided for, and only the residue is left for feeling, after this provision—the amount of which depends on the strength, nimbleness, and activity of the species—has been made. The construction of the nervous centres has also to be taken into account, as well as their size and consequent weight. In man, the surface of the brain, which is for many reasons believed to be specially or even exclusively concerned with feelings and the production of movements through feelings, has to be packed into the restricted space provided for it in the interior of the skull by folding it into a multitude of convolutions. The convolutions are very much shallower and fewer in the lower animals, with, presumably, a corresponding degradation in the intensity and variety of feelings; and the anterior lobe of the brain is less developed in proportion to the rest. The different parts of the nervous centres of the lower animals are also consolidated together less completely. So far does this want of integration go among the invertebrata that, in beetles and other insects, in worms, &c., the nervous system is little more than a double chain of knots of nervous matter extending down the ventral surface of the animal. Correlatively with this, a wasp or a moth will go on drinking a sweet fluid after it has received the most appalling injuries. The extraordinary acuteness of the senses in some animals, and the presence of special instincts (among which must apparently be counted a sense of direction), for which material concomitants have to be provided in the nervous system, also leave less room in the animal consciousness for the development of other feelings.

The vehemence with which pain is expressed depends not exclusively on its intensity, but on a variety of other circumstances, *e.g.*, on whether the animal is or is not gregarious, and on the bulk and weight of consciousness the pain has to move. Thus, an infant screams and throws itself about on account of having been pricked by the point of a pin in its clothes; and a fly which falls into water executes rapid movements, in the causation of the whole of which there is much less expenditure of nervous energy than when the hand is raised to brush another fly from the forehead. While we ought not to underrate the pains of the lower animals, our natural tendency, when we first begin to think about them seriously, is unquestionably enormously to exaggerate them, partly by interpreting them by our own higher consciousness, and partly by additional misinterpretation of the value of the expressions of animal emotion.

making of morals. All these impulses, and many others of analogous kinds, show themselves in infants long before they come to the use of reason so as to be capable of either mortal or venial sin. They are the organic and animal antecedents of the moral life. This moral life begins with the conscious disciplining of them—not in relation to a slap or a sweetmeat, though such discipline may be an introduction to the higher and later discipline—but by reference to the known law of God. It is not extraordinary that Protestants whose ethical principles have been injured by their theological principle that the *primi motus concupiscentiæ* are morally culpable, should be inclined to attribute a moral nature and consequently a future existence to the lower animals. But on Catholic principles the case is wholly different. Though in animals, as in ourselves, there exist impulses of anger and of kindness, yet, on our principles, such impulses are in themselves neither morally good nor morally evil. They may be well-placed or ill-placed, and consequently pleasant or delectable, or unpleasant to contemplate. But moral good and evil emerge only when they are viewed in relation to the moral law, and are then freely assented to or dissented from. Not only is there no evidence that the lower animals do this, but there is abundant evidence that they do not do it. Their whole mental status, and the absence among them of any rational and developed language capable of evoking such ideas, are conclusive to the contrary.

And hence it is the lower animals are entirely under our dominion to the whole extent of their possible service. This is not so with respect to other human beings, simply because *they*, on the other hand, have an immortal future, and are associated with us in this world only as it were outwardly, and accidentally, and for an infinitesimally small part of their total duration. We cannot, therefore, claim them as unreservedly our own, or exercise over them an unlimited power, even when we are physically able to do so. They have not a superficial and as it were a painted being of bodily organism, lower external sensations, dwindling internal sense-consciousness, and nothingness of moral nature. The meaning of their life becomes fuller and wider as it is more internal, until its inmost chamber reigns freedom deciding according to or

contrary to *their* conscience, and not necessarily according to what *we* think wrong or right. Under such circumstances we often have to *permit* where we do not *assent*, as God Himself permits to human freedom without assenting; whereas with respect to the lower animals when they are fully under our power, to permit is to assent. This is the reason, too, why the lower animals can be punished, not vindicatively, or to vindicate the moral law, against which they are incapable of offending, but only correctively, as infants may be punished—not because they are committing sin, but because they are doing what is injurious to themselves or others, though they do not know it. These punishments of animals, moreover, are almost uniformly inflicted on them in consequence of their doing something injurious or not doing something useful to us in the state of servitude in which we place them—and place them, of course, without their own consent.

Reverting to the question previously asked, we may now drop out of it not only the clause about inflicting pain on the brutes “without their own consent,” but also, on account of what has just been said, that about inflicting it otherwise than as punishment; and may frame our question thus: Are we morally justified, and if so under what circumstances, in giving pain to any lower animal, otherwise than for its individual advantage?

Now to answer this question (which, the reader can scarcely need to be reminded, is often asked from most kindly and benevolent motives) by saying that *nature* inflicts pain, is, obviously, no reply. Nature is divinely ordained; but is only the beginning of the divine purpose. Her deserts and marshes, her famines and inundations, are only the initial field of and stimulus to action, on which the higher activity of man has to operate. We are here to better nature. Nor is it a reply to say that one has no sympathy with beetles and flies and worms and maggots, though one may be distressed at the sufferings of a pet dog or of a favourite horse. The very question is whether one ought to have sympathy in so far as the more lowly creatures come within our sphere. The pheasants and the foxes, and the other game or vermin pursued by the sportsman, the frogs and rabbits on which snakes are fed in menageries, and even the gentles with which the angler baits his hook, must in the

nature of things endure pain. So must the seals, martens, and ermines which are shot for the sake of their fur, the birds whose plumage used cruelly to adorn the head-dresses of women; the whales harpooned for their blubber, and the millions of silkworms thrown into hot water to obtain their silk, the bees suffocated or semi-suffocated for their honey—not to speak of cod crimped when alive, of lambs and calves and porkers slowly bled to death, of oysters eaten living, and of lobsters boiled alive. All these cases, and all others of the same general character, come into view as soon as the subject of vivisection is seriously reflected on; and besides, in every part of the inhabited world are kept, principally for the purpose of killing them, many millions of domesticated or semi-domesticated animals—oxen, sheep, pigs, goats, turkeys, fowls, ducks, geese, and what not—nor do the fish and other denizens of the waters which furnish a not inconsiderable part of the food of human beings, die at their hands without pain. It need create no surprise that most of those who condemn vivisection are opponents of sport, or that many advocate the use of an exclusively vegetable diet, though if cattle, sheep, fowls, &c., were no longer reared as a supply of animal food, and the profits obtainable by selling them to the butcher or the poulterer were cut off, the prices of lard, suet, butter, and other animal fats, milk, eggs, leather, wool, and other products, would in most cases increase, and the supply notably diminish.* Even, however, if vegetarianism became the universal rule, the plough turns up at every furrow multitudes of lowly living creatures which it either summarily destroys or condemns to a lingering and more painful death; nor, indeed, can anyone walk in July across a meadow without crushing out of existence hundreds of little lives. Nor is the problem by any means exclusively one of the infliction of positive pain. It also extends itself to the privation of the pleasures natural to the several species of animals, and conformable to their respective organisations and ancestral habits—to the morality, not only of caging singing birds, or, again, of collecting wild animals into zoological gardens, but of keeping the smaller carnivora as pets (of

* An eccentric lady who a few years ago was one of the most prominent agitators in this country against vivisection, condemned, on principle, shoes, bags, and other articles made of leather.

which cats and dogs are the commonest examples), especially in towns, where scarcely a vestige remains of the manner of life to which they are specially adapted, or of opportunities for the exercise of their normal activities. Beasts of burden (to mention them, if only in passing, and thereby to remind the reader that their lot also forms part of the problem) are often badly treated; but against this there is at least something to set. They have their uses; while the great majority of the cats and dogs in any large town are of no conceivable use whatever. The cats are not wanted to catch mice, for which they were needed before mouse-traps were invented, and the dogs are scarcely more serviceable as house dogs than as sheep dogs. At best, they are pets; and ordinarily they are not even this, but mere appurtenances to a household. To be petted is as a rule to be degraded. This is so whether the pet is a human being or one of the lower animals; for pets, like kings' favourites, are usually the recipients of an abundance of sentimental effusion, but of little genuine and therefore rational kindness.

Human beings (to conclude by brief reference to them this suggestive enumeration) fall equally under the common lot of having to endure physical and mental pain, and having to put up with less than the average share of free activity and gratification, neither as a punishment, nor by their own consent, nor for their individual advantage. A sickly child, an ailing wife or husband, a paralysed father, are instances in point; and among those whose means are narrow, such cases often pierce to the very quick. Even if accidents of flood and field be omitted from the account—a stone falling from a cliff, a false step or a slippery foothold, a cold wind or the noisome exhalations of a tepid swamp, the claws of a bear or the tooth of a serpent—such compulsory self-sacrifice (which is not morally self-sacrifice unless it is freely accepted and utilised from a higher motive) is demanded of, and is exacted from ourselves, not only by the convenances and bienséances of Society, but even, where necessary, by the judgments of the national tribunals. And when particular incidents of it come on the *tapis*, we have to remember, with respect to ourselves as in regard of the lower animals, that hard cases make bad laws.

Further, the gift of immortality gives us no prerogative over humbler creatures as to the irregular distribution of pleasure and pain. The contrary has, indeed, been argued.

A reason for the adoption of a belief in the immortality of the soul is [urges a modern writer]* that such a doctrine can alone reconcile the anomalies of life. This is not a reason to influence a savage, but it is a powerful one in the breast of a man of thought and feeling. He sees the lots of men unequally balanced; misery, wrong, oppression, blot the history of the past, and smear that of the present.

Inequality is everywhere :—

History paints oppression, whirling its bloody lash after man, and man in the madness of his despair flying like Orestes to the temple of God, and there sitting as a suppliant, sullen and resolute :

“There will I keep my station and wait the event of judgment.”—(Æschylus, “Eumenides,” 240.)

Without a belief in God, the avenger of all such as call upon Him, and a future life, in which the wicked should cease from troubling and be troubled himself in turn, man, the most down-trodden of all creatures, would wrap his mantle about his face, creep like a wounded hare into a corner, and sob himself to death.

But the anomalies to be redressed in the world to come are not the physical, but the moral. To think otherwise would be to make religion an excuse for all the brutalities and cruelties that are perpetrated by men both on man and on brutes. It would be to supply them with the justification that “if the poor are oppressed here, they are compensated hereafter, so that no injustice results in the long run;” but would leave the wounded hare, without hope of immortality, to complain of injustice from God. Nay, it might even be argued that cruelty was meritorious, because it secured more merciful judgment. We must evidently go deeper than such a very shallow answer, if we are not utterly to mis-state the problem of the world. The words which our Divine Lord puts, in a parable, into the mouth of Abraham, “Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus evil things; but now here he is consoled, and thou art tormented” (Luke xvi. 25), are, on account of the context of Divine Revelation, insusceptible of being interpreted as meaning that mere and simple

* Baring-Gould, “The Origin and Development of Religious Belief.” London. 1869. Vol. i., pp. 73-75.

well-being or suffering on earth, involve, apart from any moral reaction on them, contrary conditions in the after-world. The parable portrays the state of Jewish society at the time, when the increasing corruption had entangled the rich as a class, but had not yet caught the poor, as a class, within its meshes—when, in an imperialistic age, brutalism was spreading downwards, as in an age of another kind it might spread upward from below. Dives was the wealthy Sadducee, selfish, careless of the poor at his gate, incredulous of future retribution, needing to be taught it by personal experience; Lazarus, the poor Pharisee, waiting in patience for even the morsels that fell from the rich man's table. Moral good and evil arise, not directly from pain and pleasure, but indirectly from these and from other influences through the reaction of free will and of the whole moral or ethical nature. Future rewards and punishment are consequences of merit and demerit, and not merely of enduring pain or of enjoying happiness. We all of us—or at least, all of us who are not saints, which practically comes to the same thing—again and again suffer pain, bodily or mental as the case may be, and enjoy pleasures, without bringing them at the time and with corresponding vividness, and even without bringing them at all before they are forgotten, into any moral relation; and nevertheless without being blameworthy for the omission, because no one is to be blamed for what he does not think of. We have a toothache or an earache, and we merely suffer; or the weather is fine, and we enjoy it. In such cases we act only as the lower animals do. But to say that mere pain, as such, without any moral reaction, is meritorious, is to sanctify the abodes of the lost; to declare that mere happiness or blessedness by itself and independently of any other consideration ought to be recompensed by punishment, is to bring an invincible serpent into Eden, and to make God the most wicked of all existent beings. Even where a free being is made to suffer, no one can say whether the effect will be to make it turn to the source of consolation, or to harden and to brutalise. The one-sided insistence on pleasure as distinguished from duty, and on happiness as distinguished from heroism—on avoiding pain instead of moral evil, and avoiding misery instead of baseness—is one of the deepest cankers of modern life. The softness of a delicate civilisation allies itself to the long-standing

infirmities of human nature, and supplies an additional motive for neglecting duty, the claims of which are to the eyes of reason infinitely superior to those of pain and pleasure.

The answer to the problem of pleasure and pain as such (as far as any satisfactory answer can be given in our present state of existence), cannot, from what has been said above, be that these two have in equity to be compensated by counter-pain for the pleasure and by counter-pleasure for the pain; but must be some other kind. It must be largely conjectural, because these are points on which Natural Reason is obscure, and on which from the nature of the case Revelation does not enlighten us, for the general reason that it was meant as a light to our moral conduct, and was not intended to satisfy our intellectual curiosity in any other sense than that in which our intelligence ought to be satisfied (in these remote matters which are God's own peculiar province), when we are sufficiently guided to our duty. Revelation does not tell us about the inhabitants (if there are any) of the stars. We have to cultivate our own garden. As little does it inform us what the Divine Purpose is as to the pleasures and pains which are not taken up and utilised by a moral nature, but wander about the world, as it were, whether among ourselves or among the lower animals. But the most likely guess seems to be that for the lower animals (and for human beings in so far as moral good and evil does not enter into the reckoning) the balance is on the side of happiness—happiness, we must concede in the case of creatures of lowly organisation, which is of only a low order as compared with that of higher beings, but happiness still. We can fairly claim to interpret any apparent exceptions by the general rule. There are other horses besides cab-horses, and other animals besides those of the equine species. There are birds that sing in the air and in the hedgerows, and fishes that disport themselves in the seas; flocks and herds in the meadows and the prairies, and fierce hearts in the recesses of the wilderness, which also have their happiness. An old writer charmingly says:—

God's design is not abortive. It is a happy world after all. In a spring noon, or on a summer evening, on whichever side I turn my eyes, myriads of happy beings meet my view. "The insect youth are on the wing." Swarms of new-born flies are trying their pinions on the air.

Their sportive motions, their wanton mazes, their gratuitous activity, their continual change of place without use or purpose, testify their joy and the exultation which they feel in their lately discovered faculties. A bee, amongst the flowers in spring, is one of the most cheerful objects that can be looked upon. Its life appears to be all enjoyment, so busy and so pleased; yet it is only a specimen of insect life, with which, by reason of the animal being half domesticated, we happen to be better acquainted than we are with that of others.*

The pleasure, the "sensible" or sensuous happiness, of the lower races of animated creatures, is no more moral excellence than their pain is moral evil. But it is a kind of anticipatory type, a note of the same general kind, something "good," harbingering the higher good which was later to be introduced into the world.

We have now impartially (and not unjustly or untenderly as far as the lower animals are concerned) to examine the two contrasted attitudes taken up with regard to vivisection. One of these starts from the positions, to which the phraseology of the scholastic philosophy distinctly points, that the lower animals have no rights, and that to act rightly is to act reasonably. From insensible changes in the meanings of the terms, this has come to look as if it meant that whatever you do to a lower animal you can do no wrong: that you may bake or boil it alive, or tear it limb from limb, or prick a worm with pins to see how often and in what ways it will wriggle, and that nevertheless you commit no sin. Such a principle would, it is evident, suffice to justify whatever excesses of cruelty it is possible to commit on any inferior creature; and though it is soon perceived that this is by no means the intention of the writers, the manner in which they supply the necessary correction is by a modern scarcely less liable to be misapprehended; for, they declare, you must follow right reason. "What!" the reader is inclined to exclaim, "is sin, is crime, on a par with wearing one's coat inside out?" Those who retain a remembrance of nursery rhymes are aware that

There was an old man of Thermopylæ,
Who never did anything properly;
So they said, "If you choose,
Why, boil eggs in your shoes,
But you shall not remain at Thermopylæ."

* Paley, "Natural Theology," chap. xxvi.

The old gentleman's use of his shoes was unreasonable, no doubt; but was his domestic perversity a moral crime demanding the punishment of exile?

Reason here means reason considering moral distinctions. But the meanings of the terms, it is evident, have changed. The original meaning of *jus*, right, is *id quod jussum est*, that which is commanded; and every *jus* or right was in the minds of the Roman jurists, from which the phraseology was taken directly or indirectly by the canonists and the schoolmen, correlative with an *officium* or *obligatio*, or, in other words, with a duty. To say that X has a right, *e.g.*, to his property or to his life, is to say in different phraseology that Y, Z, and others have incumbent on them a duty of not appropriating the first or destroying the second. These and other rights, however, are given to him because the performance of duties is expected from him. His rights are to give him scope for his duties, and if he refuses to discharge those duties—if, for example, he takes the property or the lives of others—he may be justly deprived of his own property or of his life. Rights are the echoes of duties; and it is not only improper, but impossible, to impose on others moral obligations whose objects are beings which cannot in the nature of the case discharge moral obligations themselves. For every *quid* there must be a *quo*.

Further, in this phraseology, a duty, and consequently the right correlative to it, is imposed by some law; and a law is a general command of a legitimate superior, given for the common good. Change, then, the implications involved in the idea of law, and the ideas of right and duty are correspondingly altered. But in the Imperial Jurisprudence it was of the essence of a law that it acted not as a mere impetus or impulse, nor yet as an allurements or enticement on the one hand or a simple threat on the other; but as a command addressing itself to the intelligence, and claiming obedience on the double ground of proceeding from a legitimate superior, and having for its object the common good. As, therefore, duties are created by the operation of laws, and as laws, in so far forth as they are laws, act through the recognition, by the subjects to whom they are addressed, of the legitimate authority of the superior who enacts them and of the common good to which they are directed, it follows that (in the above sense of

law and duty) a law cannot be addressed to, or a duty be incumbent on, a being incapable of apprehending the above ideas. Hence the lower animals, whose actions proceed from mere vital spontaneity or fulness of life, or from the special stimuli of pleasure and pain, and, *a fortiori*, plants and inanimate objects, are not directly the objects of law in the above sense of law, and are incapable of duty or moral obligation as above described. And, again, a law cannot impose a moral obligation for an inadequate motive, because, if it did so, it would not be just or equitable, and would not be a law in the proper sense of the word. An obligation of the moral order cannot therefore be founded on a claim which is not also of the moral order, though this may suffice to justify a penal law, which is a law in another and inferior sense of the word law, and draws after it an *obligatio mense pœnalis*.* But in a lower animal, considered purely and simply in itself, there is nothing which is truly and properly of the *moral* order. Being merely a creature of simple or associated pleasures and pains, and incapable of even understanding what is meant by law or by moral obligation, it has no moral obligations incumbent on it; and as rights are given by law as the correlatives of such obligations, it has, *per se*, and considered in itself, no rights.

This, then, is the meaning of the statement that “Animals have no Rights;” but it is not even in the most remote manner implied thereby that no rights possessed by other beings favourably touch or affect them. For, in the first place, God, not indeed as the subject, but as the author of Law, possesses rights—possesses, indeed, the Supreme Legislative Authority by which all moral obligations and all creaturely rights are created; and though, in the phraseology which has been explained in the preceding paragraph, animals cannot be said to possess rights in themselves, yet in their faculties and capacities of pleasure and pain they have a *fundamentum in re* for moral obligations in us, when they are considered not

* By a Penal Law is meant an ordinance which does not address itself to the conscience of the community, but to its susceptibilities with respect to pleasure and pain, *i.e.*, the essence of it is *not* that whoever disobeys it will do what is morally wrong, *but* that if he is found out he will be punished. Unjust taxation affords an example. If any one has already contributed his full share to the public expenditure, he is not *per se* bound in conscience to give more; though he may be chastised not with whips, but with scorpions, if he is discovered to have evaded unjust exactions.

isolatedly, by themselves, or apart from every other consideration, but in connection with the whole scheme of nature, as sharers of the world with us, as an integral part of the creation of God, and themselves the work of His hands. "Thou shalt not," directs the Mosaic Law, teaching, as usual, by examples, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn." Nothing even suggesting barbarity was to be done, for "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk." Even among little considered creatures "Not one of them falls to the ground without your Father." God "made" and "preserves" "both man and beast." "They wait upon Him, that He may give them their food in due season." Even if we did not already know it by the light of nature, we might have learnt from Revelation that "He loves all that He has made." "The merciful man regards the life of," is merciful to, "his beast," and, in connection with this, only "the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel."* If, on the other hand, we regard the lower animals in their relations with man, there is in human nature a divinely implanted principle of moral benevolence, which has for its principal object the moral good of others, but also prompts to the giving of pleasure where this is not counter-indicated by some mischief which would result from it, and prohibits the *gratuitous* infliction of pain. And this, being a principle of well-wishing as such and therefore without restriction, extends to whatever we can help or benefit, and consequently overflows on the more lowly sentient creatures which are with us in the world. For these two reasons they

* Deut. xxv. 4 ; xiv. 21 ; Matth. xii. 29 ; Ps. xxxv. [xxxvi.] 6 ; Jer. xxvii. 5 ; Ps. ciii. [civ.] 27 ; Wisdom, xi. 25 ; Prov. xii. 10 ; and parallel passages. No attentive reader of Holy Scripture needs to be more than reminded how full of fellow-feeling it is with the inferior creation ; it extends human sympathy to them not only by authoritative dogmas, as, that all things alike were made by God ; but by innumerable little touches : and this in spite of the cruelty of the ancient world not only to animals but to human beings, and in spite of the fact that sympathy was wanted more for and could begin only with man. The love of animals is by the nature of the case a later lesson than the love of man. "He," says St. John, "who loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen ?" (1 Jo. iv. 20). On the same principle, "He, who does not love mankind, with whom he is more intimately allied, how can he love lower creatures with which as a man his association is more remote ?" A tame sparrow, or a pampered hound, may divert our sympathies from their principal and most useful course. But "Each in its own order," as St. Paul says in another connection ; the aberration is abnormal and injurious. For whatever is wasted on a pet lap-dog, some human sufferer has to suffer more.

have claims on us which are analogous to rights and have been called "Analogical Rights."

On these accounts, it is accepted on all hands that the gratuitous infliction of pain is morally evil. Whoever gives pain for nothing will have to answer for it, if (that is to say) he acted with knowledge and advertence on the part of the intellect, and with freedom and deliberation on the part of the will. The culpability is on general moral principles proportionate to the magnitude or quantity of the pain uncompensated. This, if only pain has to be weighed on the other scale of the balance, is again proportionate to its severity, its duration, its certainty, and its existence (*i.e.*, the number of persons, or beings other than persons, to whom or to which it extends). A pain or an assemblage of pains of such and such a nett severity—*i.e.*, of such and such a severity after pleasures which are connected with it and other pains which hang together with it have been allowed for—is evidently twice as great an evil if it lasts for twice the time. Of two pains, one which is a certainty (like that inflicted, if any is inflicted, in a physiological experiment) lies twice as heavy in the balance as another of which the probability is only $\frac{1}{2}$, or an even chance, and a pain or complexus of pains which affects two beings is, *cæteris paribus*, twice as grave as one which affects only one. Similarly of the withdrawal or privation of pleasure, which (as we have seen) may be and continually is balanced against the endurance of pain. What, then, is cruelty? It is, from the point of view of pain and pleasure, which alone we are here for the moment considering, the gratuitous infliction of pain.

Suppose we could numerically count up the factors—the severity (or in the case of a pleasure, the intensity), the duration, the certainty or probability, and the extent—of the nett pain-weight of an aggregate of pains inflicted on other beings, and they amounted to sixty; and if we could also numerically reckon up the nett pain-weight of the pains avoided to other beings, and they amounted only to twenty: the objective cruelty, the overplus or uncompensated or gratuitous pain, would be forty. In such a case the infliction of the pain would be morally evil in a person who realised the state of the case. He would be guilty of cruelty, or, in other words, of so acting as to increase the total amount of gratuitous suffering in the

world. Suppose, on the other hand, that the pain-weight of suffering inflicted was sixty, and that saved or avoided 100, whoever refused to inflict the pain would be guilty of cruelty to the same extent of forty. He would by his refusal be permitting (and, as we have seen, there is here no difference between permission and commission) the total amount of pain to be augmented by forty. In giving this example it is not, of course, meant that we human beings can numerically reckon up these sensation-values. A being with higher faculties would be able to do so. We are capable only of forming rough estimates. But what it is hereby attempted to illustrate is the principle of the thing; which is, that it depends on the inutility or utility of physiological experimentation whether "vivisectionists" or "anti-vivisectionists" are guilty of the sin of cruelty. What the verdict of those best entitled to judge of the utility or inutility of physiological experiments really is has been already recited. Let it be well remembered that it is quite as possible to be cruel by refusing to inflict immediate pain or to allow it to be inflicted as by inflicting it. A father, for instance, has a child who is suffering from a diseased bone in the leg. His imagination revolts from the very suggestion of the operation which alone would effect a cure; from the bleeding, the cutting, the punching or excision of the bone, the stitching, the pus, and the dressings. He thereby condemns his own child to years, it may be, of misery, or to death. If he knows what he is doing, what is he but abominably cruel? If he does not realise the genuine character of his conduct, what is the predominant tendency of the present age to which he belongs? Is it to inflict suffering directly? Is it not rather to inflict it indirectly, by refusing, as anti-vivisectionists refuse, to cause it in a direct manner?

But though the question is only one of pleasure and pain when it is posed as between one lower animal and another, it puts on an altogether different aspect when it is asked with a reference to man. Even if we (very artificially) limit ourselves to the mere comparison of human pains with the pains of brutes,* the two are not the same thing, but human pain

* Here, and elsewhere in this paper, the terms "brute" and "beast" are employed only for variation of phraseology, to avoid the iteration, which the subject would otherwise involve, of "animal" and "lower animal." No bye-

has, even as pain, ulterior implications which brute-pain has not. Besides, it means more than pain even in this temporal sphere. It carries with it, as a rule, incapacity for the duties of life; and this means wasted lives, ruined homes, neglected children, friends alienated by the petulance of the sick, lessened good, fears for the temporal and spiritual future of others, broken hopes, temptations to despair, hereditary disease, the decay of families, of nations; none of which, except in a very inferior and analogical way, can exist in the lower animals. Nor, as some at least of these examples will have shown, is it solely or even principally a question of pain; but is one of understanding better the laws of life, and of applying the knowledge to the moral benefit of whole generations to come.

On what theories, then, do the lower animals possess Rights in any other than the analogical sense defended in a previous paragraph? On two theories, one of which exaggerates their status into an essential equality with that of human beings, while the other degrades ourselves to the animal level. The first has already been briefly, but sufficiently, discussed. It is that which supposes that the brutes have a knowledge of right, wrong, duty, law, God, as man has; and is seldom held by solid-headed men or women. The second, which is called Hedonism or Eudæmonism (from the Greek *ἡδονή*, *hedoné*, pleasure, and *εὐδαιμονία*, *eudaimonia*, happiness), is that the good and evil of human actions are merely other names for their power of producing pleasure and pain. On this theory, whatever gives pleasure is right, and is right in proportion to the pleasure which it gives, and whatever gives pain is wrong; not because of any prior considerations of benevolence or of cruelty, but because according to the theory right *means* pleasure-producing, and the only meaning of wrong is "productive of pain." The determining principle in conformity to which anything is to be pronounced bad or good is the balance of pain and pleasure, and pleasures are to be reckoned as higher or lower solely in proportion as they are more or less agreeable to the being by whom, or by which, they are

meaning of contempt or depreciation is intended to be conveyed by them. *Brutum antiqui gravem dicebant*, says Festus: the brute is simply the heavy matter, the *βαρὺ τι*, not worked up, as it were, to the fineness and delicacy of human nature; and *bestia* has the same general meaning.

enjoyed, and not from any higher motives. This theory (according to which all sentient beings are of course essentially on the same footing as far as right and wrong are concerned) has been set forth under two forms. On one of these, which is called Utilitarianism, what we ought to consider is the greatest happiness of the greatest number, or, to put it less ambiguously, the greatest happiness, no matter who has it—meaning by happiness, largest sum-total of nett pleasure, everything considered. This, however, is immediately analysable into the other form, the form called the Selfish Theory; for if we are to go on a mere pain and pleasure basis, what are the pleasures of others to me, except in so far as they affect myself? Utilitarians urge “if you do not consider others, they will punish you.” Those of the second party reply: “Not unless I get found out.” But it is needless to enter into the details of the discussion. The essence of the matter is that, in agreement with the tendencies of modern life, pleasure and pain are substituted for moral good and evil, and that, this being so, Utilitarians are the principal patrons of “Animal’s Rights.”*

The common anti-vivisectionist position is egoism turned upside down: that though *we* have to suffer not as a punishment, and independently of our own consent, for the benefit of others, the lower animals should be exempted. Pain is in it confounded with moral evil; rights are dislocated from their moral basis; Utilitarianism, or the greatest happiness principle, is turned against humanity; and the sensitiveness to pain and pleasure which is a new thing in the history of mankind, is attributed even to the lower creation. For the last three hundred years—in fact, ever since the discovery of the East and the West Indies—the intelligence of mankind has been increasingly applied to the enhancement of pleasures and the avoidance of pains. We have become proportionately sensitive both to the one and to the other. Pain-saving and labour-saving inventions have been multiplied; anæsthetics and anodynes have been introduced; the steady comforts of

* If the Utilitarian position was only that we ought so to act as to promote the greatest common happiness, it would of course be entirely commendable. But the case is altogether changed when it is added that our motive in doing so is to be mere pleasure and pain.

ordinary life have grown upon us; tea and coffee and spices and silk have been brought to our shores; and the world has been ransacked to find a new odour, a new taste, a fresh colour, an additional timbre or modulation of sound. No one not extraordinarily unwise would suppose that this would be without effect on our tone of thought, on our philosophy, and even on our theology. And the effect has come. Pleasure is confounded with moral good; and the infliction of pain, even for ultimately good and useful purposes, is shrunk from with abhorrence, and is even qualified as a crime. What the ulterior consequences will be can only be conjectured. But I will conclude by laying before the reader the opinion of one who was himself a Utilitarian; and though I cannot say "Amen" to every phrase, I will not for that reason dock or clip our extract:

One of the effects of civilization (not to say one of the ingredients in it) is, that the spectacle, and even the very idea, of pain, is kept more and more out of the sight of those classes who enjoy in their fulness the benefits of civilization. The state of perpetual personal conflict, rendered necessary by the circumstances of former times, and which it was hardly possible for any person, in whatever rank of society, to be exempt, necessarily habituated every one to the spectacle of harshness, rudeness, and violence, to the struggle of one indomitable will against another, and to the alternate suffering and infliction of pain. These things, consequently, were not as revolting to the best and most actively benevolent men of former days as they are to our own; and we find the recorded conduct of these men frequently such as would be universally considered very unfeeling in a person of our own day. They, however, thought less of the infliction of pain, because they thought less of pain altogether. When we read of actions of the Greeks and Romans, or of our own ancestors, denoting callousness to human suffering, we must not think that those who committed these actions were as cruel as we must become before we could do the like. The pain which they inflicted they were in the habit of voluntarily undergoing from slight causes; it did not appear to them so great an evil as it appears, and as it really is, to us, nor did it in any way degrade their minds. In our own time, the necessity of personal collision between one person and another is, comparatively speaking, almost at an end. All those necessary portions of the business of society which oblige any person to be the immediate agent or the ocular witness of the infliction of pain, are delegated by common consent to peculiar and narrow classes: to the judge, the soldier, the surgeon, the butcher, and the executioner. To most persons in easy circumstances almost any pain, except that inflicted upon the body by accident or disease, and upon the mind by the inevitable sorrows of life, is rather a thing known

of than actually experienced. This is much more emphatically true in the more refined classes, and as refinement advances ; for it is in avoiding the presence not only of actual pain, but of whatever suggests offensive or disagreeable ideas, that a great part of refinement consists. We may remark, too, that this is possible only by a perfection of mechanical arrangements impracticable in any but a high state of civilization. Now, most kinds of pain and annoyance appear much more unendurable to those who have little experience of them, than to those who have much. The consequence is that, compared with former times, there is in the more opulent classes of modern civilized communities much more of the amiable and humane, and much less of the heroic. The heroic essentially consists in being ready, for a worthy object, to do and to suffer, but especially to do, what is painful or disagreeable ; and whoever does not learn early to be capable of this, will never be a great character. There has crept over the refined classes, over the whole class of gentlemen in England, a moral effeminacy, an inaptitude for every kind of struggle. They shrink from all effort, and from everything which is troublesome and disagreeable. The same causes which render them sluggish and unenterprising, make them, it is true, for the most part, stoical under inevitable evils. But heroism is an active, not a passive quality ; and when it is necessary not to bear pain, but to seek it, little need be expected from the men of the present day. They cannot undergo labour, they cannot brook ridicule, they cannot brave evil tongues ; they have not the hardihood to say an unpleasant thing to any one whom they are in the habit of seeing, or to face, even with a nation at their back, the coldness of some little coterie which surrounds them. This torpidity and cowardice, as a general characteristic, is new in the world ; but (modified by the different temperaments of different nations) it is a natural consequence of the progress of civilization, and will continue until met by a system of civilization adapted to counteract it.—J. S. Mill, “Dissertations and Discussions.” London, 1859. Vol. i., pp. 179–181.

ROBERT F. CLARKE.

ART. VI.—THE PRE-REFORMATION ENGLISH BIBLE.

FOR some years now duty has taken me almost daily through the King's Library at the British Museum. There—reposing on cushions of purple velvet, in a spacious shrine of polished oak, marked “number 1”—is a large and handsome manuscript volume written in the fourteenth century,* which rightly attracts the attention of many visitors. I have frequently stopped on my way past this case to admire the well-written page with its painted border, and again and again I have read and re-read this legend, inscribed on a card below : *The English Bible, Wycliffe's translation*. Passing this interesting book, as I did often many times a day, I conceived a desire to know something more about it, and so taking advantage of an hour, free from other occupations, I wrote a request for a personal interview in the students' room, and a few minutes later had the pleasure of finding the manuscript at my desk there. The present article is really the result of a train of researches and considerations started at that interview.

I suppose most of us have been taught to regard with feelings of some awe, although hardly perhaps with much reverence, the strange personality of Wyclif. Whatever we may hold as Catholics as to his unsound theological opinions, about which there can be no doubt ; or as peace-loving citizens about his wild and revolutionary social theories, on which there can be still less, few of us I fancy would venture to grudge him the credit which rightly attaches to what is known *par excellence* as his work—the translation of the Bible into the English language—or to deny him the title of “Father of English prose” thereby so justly earned. Why should he not have all his due, morning star as he is of the glorious “Reformation” ? Is it not written in all our school books and taught to every child that the first vernacular translation of God's word was conceived and carried into execution by this same John Wyclif

* Egerton MSS., 617, 618.

in the fourteenth century? As an instance of what is believed on all hands upon this matter, we may conveniently take the account given by Mr. F. D. Matthew in his Preface to the *English Works of Wyclif*, published by the *Early English Text Society*:

Of Wyclif's other religious task, the translation of the Bible, I need say little (he writes); its consequences to English religion and to the English tongue are generally recognised. We have but to look at the long list of MSS., given at the beginning of Forshall and Madden's great edition (170), and to remember that these are but the gleanings, after time, neglect and the zeal of the inquisitor have gathered in their harvests, and we see how widely the translation was disseminated and how eagerly men caught at the opportunity of reading the Bible in their mother tongue.*

Moreover, beyond the fact of Wyclif's connection with this great work, as here stated, the actual circumstances under which the task was in the end accomplished are not unfrequently related with considerable detail. Take, for example, the following given in a book on the Bible placed on the shelves of the reference library in the Museum: Wyclif's

translation, which was finished in the year 1380, is supposed to have occupied him amidst various interruptions for many years (writes the author). Some have imagined that this great work employed the translator for ten years only, but Mr. Barber with far greater probability has said: "From an early period of his life he had devoted his various learning and all the powerful energies of his mind to effect this, and at length by intense application on his own part, and with some assistance from a few of the most learned of his followers, he had the glory to complete a book, which alone would have been sufficient (or at least ought) to have procured him the veneration of his own age and the commendations of posterity."†

The same story is told by our masters in the literature of this country:

We hear of it in the fourteenth century, this grand word of God writes M. Taine). It quitted the learned schools, the dead languages, the dusty shelves on which the clergy suffered it to sleep, covered with a confusion of commentators and fathers. Wyclif appeared and translated it like Luther and in a spirit similar to Luther's.‡

* P. xvii.

† Christopher Anderson, "Annals of the English Bible," Introduction, p. xxxvii.

‡ Taine, "History of English Literature," i. p. 166.

Nor is this implicit belief in the intimate connection between the pre-Reformation translation of the Bible and the so-called "reformer" of the fourteenth century, confined to non-Catholic writers. Whatever may have been the case with our earlier chroniclers and historians, in modern days it is generally accepted. Lingard, for example, in his "History" under the reign of Richard II., states that :

Wyclif made a new translation (of the sacred writings), multiplied the copies with the aid of transcribers, and by his poor priests recommended it to the perusal of their hearers. In their hands it became an engine of wonderful power.

A similar statement will also be found in that useful book "The Catholic Dictionary."

We may take it then that the *fact* of Wyclif's connection with the first translation of the Holy Bible into English is generally, if not universally, accepted as true. I wonder how many there are out of the hundreds that annually visit the old parish church of Lutterworth, who venture to criticise even the evidence which is offered to them there? At the west end of Wyclif's old parish church may still be seen a venerable oaken table, supported by heraldic lions holding scrolls, which the credulous visitor is told represent the Scriptures. At this table sat Wyclif, when now more than five centuries ago, he was engaged in the great work of popularising the Word of God—at least so said the venerable verger, and I have little doubt that on his testimony thousands of eyes have regarded this relic with becoming awe and reverence.

Over and above this full and implicit belief in Wyclif's connection with the English Bible, there can be no doubt that most people are inclined to think, with my friend the Lutterworth parish clerk, that so determined were the English ecclesiastical authorities to prevent the laity having the Scripture in the vernacular, that poor Wyclif's troubles were entirely due to his determination to furnish his countrymen with God's word at all costs ; and that during the next century or more his Lollard followers were hunted down and done to death chiefly, if not altogether, for endeavouring to spread their master's translated Scriptures.

Now what are we to believe on the matter? My purpose in this article is simply to examine into what we really know

on this question. To some the very existence of the numerous manuscript copies of the English Scriptures will be accounted sufficient evidence of Wyclif's handiwork, just as the rocks in the valley were to Herodotus proofs of the truth of the legend that the Gods had hurled them from the heights above. But "I know it to be true, for I have seen the rocks," is evidence of a character which, let us hope, is likely to satisfy few in these days of scientific investigation.

The chief points for our consideration then may be stated thus:

1. On what evidence is the first English translation of the Bible, or any part of it, ascribed to Wyclif?
2. What had Wyclif's immediate followers or later adherents to say to the composition of the work or to its spread among the people generally?
3. What prohibitions, if any, existed against the vernacular translations of the Sacred Scriptures in the Church in England? And
4. Is there any evidence for thinking that an orthodox Catholic vernacular version ever existed?

At the outset of any inquiry into the connection between Wyclif and the first English Bible, it is not unimportant to recall the warning given by Professor Shirley not too readily to credit the Reformer with any English work of the period. "Half the English religious tracts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries," he writes in the Introduction to the *Fasciculus Zizaniorum*, "have been assigned to him in the absence of all external, and in defiance of all internal evidence."* That this is really the case cannot for a moment be doubted by any one who has made a personal examination of the tracts written at this period. For a very long time past it has been quite sufficient that a pious tract of that age be in English, for it to be at once and unhesitatingly ascribed to Wyclif or one of his followers. It is perhaps hardly wonderful that this should be the case when the position occupied by Wyclif at this period in the history of England be taken into account. His was perhaps the most striking figure at a time when English began to be the language of the nation. We are

* Introduction, p. xiii.

apt to forget the fact that till past the middle of the fourteenth century French was actually the language of the Court and of the educated classes generally. Only in 1363, for the first time, was the sitting of Parliament opened by an English speech, and in the previous year only had it been enacted that the pleadings in the courts of law might be in English in place of the French which had hitherto been the legal language ; but even then the record of the proceedings was still to be in Latin. French, however, continued for almost a century longer to be the language of the upper classes, and in it were written the rolls of Parliament, and such wills and deeds which were not in Latin. An explanation of this retention of the French language is of course to be found in the circumstances of the time. Before the era of Wyclif consequently all who were able to read at all, could readily find in the Latin version of the Holy Scriptures, or in such French versions as existed in England, what they required.

Such, then, is the very simple explanation of the non-existence of any English translation of the entire Bible before the time when Wyclif came upon the scene. In the first half of the fourteenth century probably the only entire book of Scripture which had appeared in English prose was the book of Psalms translated by Richard Rolle, who died in 1349. This work he undertook at the request of Dame Margaret Kirkby, a recluse at Hampole. At the same time probably another translation of the Psalms was made by William de Schorham, a priest of Chart Sutton, near Leeds, in the county of Kent, about 1320.

Besides these, however, there were the metrical paraphrases of Genesis and Exodus, the *Ormulum* or poetical version of the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, the work of an Augustinian canon called Orm, and more than one metrical translation of the Psalms, approaching almost to a literal translation, all productions of the thirteenth century. It is, moreover, of interest to remark that after the Norman Conquest, whilst the wants of the educated class were satisfied by the Norman-French translations, "the Anglo-Saxon version of the Gospels was copied as late as the twelfth century."*

* E. M. Thompson, Wycliffe Exhibition (British Museum), p. xvii.

Meagre as is the evidence then of vernacular versions of the Sacred Scriptures in England previous to the close of the first half of the fourteenth century, it is sufficient to show that the idea did not originate with Wyclif, and was not the outcome of his movement. The simple fact being that it was not until his era that the need for vernacular versions became pressing; or, indeed, until at that time the undoubted establishment of the supremacy of English as the national language became assured. The so-called Reformer of the fourteenth century was fortunate in the time in which he lived, so far as this is concerned; and, if to have ascribed to one much that does not of right belong is to be accounted as good fortune, then Wyclif was indeed greatly blessed in being a great personality in an age when pens began to be busy on English tracts and English translations. Because for this sole reason, as Mr. Maunde Thompson, the principal librarian of the British Museum, well observes, "it is not surprising that much has been ascribed to him which is due to writers whose names have died."

It will perhaps be thought that this can hardly with any possibility be the case in respect to so important a matter as the translation of the Bible into English. Yet what as a fact do we know about it? In the first place, the tendency to ascribe to Wyclif what clearly is not his is directly illustrated in regard to Biblical literature. The commentary on the Apocalypse, which probably dates from the middle of the fourteenth century, and those on the Gospels of SS. Matthew, Luke, and John, were all believed to be the works of his pen, "although recent criticism has rejected his claim to the authorship."* It is also, I believe, very questionable whether the translation of Clement of Lanthony's Harmony of the Gospels, known as *One of Four*, was Wyclif's work at all, as is often asserted. The version differs from the received Wycliffite text, and the only reason apparently for ascribing it to him is the existence in one copy of an Introduction, in which the practice of reading the Scripture used in the Church services in English after the Latin is defended. The most that can be said is that *possibly* Wyclif may have been the translator, although there exists no evidence that such was the case.

* Thompson, *ut sup.* p. xvii.

Passing now to the translation of the Bible itself, it will probably be a surprise to many to learn that only "the New Testament portion," as Mr. Maunde Thompson has pointed out, can be said even "probably" to be due "to the hand of Wycliffe himself." The rest it is tolerably certain owes nothing to his pen. Of the second, or revised version of the whole Scriptures, the same high authority says: "Wyclif himself, who above others would be conscious of defects, *may* have commenced the work of revision. He did not, however, live to see it accomplished."* So far then as Wyclif personally is concerned, the New Testament portion of the version, which goes under his name, is all that can be said even as *probably* his work. The part taken by Wyclif's immediate followers will be treated of later; but first it is well clearly to understand upon what evidence even the probability of Wyclif's having had anything to do with the translation of the New Testament is based.

The Introduction to the edition of the Wycliffite Scriptures by Messrs. Forshall and Madden may be taken as gathering together every particle of evidence on the matter. The learned editors, by the way, hold like Mr. Thompson, that only the Gospels can with any probability be assigned to Wyclif himself. The evidence for this conclusion is practically the following:

1. John Hus, writing in Bohemia against the Carmelite John Stokes, about 1411, says: "It is reported among the English that he (*i.e.*, Wyclif) translated the whole Bible from Latin into English."† It is now allowed by all that there is not even a probability that he did anything of the kind.

2. Henry Knyghton, the Canon of Leicester, complains that Wyclif had made the Gospel cheap and common "by translating it from Latin into English."

3. In a letter addressed by Archbishop Arundel and his suffragans of the Province of Canterbury to Pope John XXIII. it is certainly implied that Wyclif at least propagated his errors against the Christian faith by the aid of new translations of Holy writ.

On the other hand, it is difficult to account for the silence of Wyclif himself, who in none of his undoubted writings, so

* Thompson, *ut sup.* p. xix.

† Hus, *Historia et Monumenta*, ed. 1558, p. cvii.

far as I am aware, lays any stress on, or, indeed, in any way advocates having the Scriptures in the vernacular; except in so far as he claims that the Bible is the sole guide in faith and practice for all.

Equally difficult is it to explain the silence of contemporaries generally; for with the exceptions given, though many have written very fully about Wyclif and his errors, not one has noticed any connection between him and the English translations of the Holy Scriptures. This is true even of his chief adversaries who attack him so freely, and whose works against him are so full, so complete, and so voluminous. Neither Woodford, nor Walden, nor Whethamstede so much as refer to Wyclif's translations, or to any special desire upon his part to circulate God's word in English among the people. On a review of all the circumstances, however—and, although I do not think it impossible to explain Knighton as meaning that the English version of the Sacred Scriptures of which he, as a personal opinion, strongly disapproved was accountable for the spread of erroneous opinions—I am inclined to think that there is some ground for holding that Wyclif may possibly have had a share in some translation of the New Testament. The ground, I must confess, is not very firm or certain, and from what we know of Wyclif's active, restless, and combative disposition, and of his particularly speculative turn of mind, we should hardly have been disposed to assign to him so tedious a task as that of mere translation.

We can now pass to the second point to be considered in regard to this matter—namely, What had Wyclif's immediate followers to say to the translation of the Bible? We may conveniently again take Mr. Maunde Thompson's account as expressing what is known, or rather conjectured, on this subject. It will be noticed how extremely vague and uncertain the information at hand really is:

In this (*i.e.*, the translation of the Old Testament into English; he writes), which was probably the work of Nicholas Hereford, one of Wycliffe's most ardent followers at Oxford, the Latin was rendered too literally, to the disadvantage of the English translation. Two MSS. of the Old Testament which are preserved in the Bodleian Library are of the greatest value for the history of the Wycliffite version. For one of these is the original MS. of the translator; and the other, which is transcribed from it, has a note at the end assigning the work to Hereford.

It is remarkable that both MSS. break off abruptly in Baruch, iii. 20. Hence it may be inferred that the translator was interrupted in his work and never resumed it. When we remember that Hereford was summoned before the Synod in 1382, and that soon after he left England to appeal to Rome, we may fairly conjecture that it was at that date that he suddenly ceased from his labours. The remaining portion of the Old Testament may have been finished by Wycliffe himself. The whole of the Bible therefore (?) was probably completed by the end of the year 1382.

This so far regards the earlier of the two translations which now go under the name of the Wycliffite Scriptures. If the note ascribing the version to Nicholas Hereford is, as Forshall and Madden testify, practically contemporary, it certainly furnishes us with strong evidence that Hereford had a main hand in the translation of the Old Testament. The English version of the Psalms, it may be remarked, was certainly founded on that of Hampole. It is of interest consequently to know something more of this Nicholas Hereford. He was a Doctor of Divinity of Queen's College, Oxford, and with many other members of the University he, in the beginning of the Wycliffite movement, took the side of the Reformer, and was cited to appear before the London Synod in 1382. Having been excommunicated for holding dangerous opinions, he appealed to the Pope; but in 1391 he received letters of protection from the king, and three years later his character as a true son of the Church was so clearly established that he received the office of Chancellor in the Diocese of Hereford, and subsequently also became Treasurer. In 1417, however, he resigned his dignities and became a Carthusian monk in the Coventry Charterhouse, where he died. So far then and no further does the evidence take us as to the first translation.

Of the second or revised version, Mr. Thompson gives the following account :

A revised version was undertaken probably soon after. The difference in style between the Old and New Testaments was unsatisfactory, and Wycliffe himself, who above others would be conscious of defects, may have commented the work of revision. He did not, however, live to see it accomplished. It was carried to a successful issue by John Purvey, his disciple and the friend of his last days, and was given to the world probably about the year 1388.*

* Thompson, *ut sup.* p. xix.

Now I believe that practically the only direct evidence to connect Purvey with this translation is the fact that his name appears in a single copy of the revision as a former owner. Like Hereford, Purvey was an ardent follower of Wyclif, and lived with him at Lutterworth during the later years of his life. In 1400 Purvey made a public recantation of his opinions at St. Paul's, and he subsequently appears to have held ecclesiastical preferment. He was a man apparently of great ability, and Walden, the chief English opponent of the Wycliffites, speaks of him as "an illustrious doctor of great authority."

There is one circumstance about this second translation which, according to the received idea, was inspired by Wyclif, even if he did not actively assist in the commencement of it, that requires notice. In some few copies there exists a lengthy prologue which gives an account of the method employed by the translator. Since whatever the author says of these methods, is borne out in the actual version, there is no room for doubting, as Henry Wharton long ago observed, that the prologues and the translation are by the same hand.

For these reasons and other (wrote the author of the preface), with common charity to save all men in our realm which God will have saved, a simple creature hath translated the Bible out of Latin into English. First the simple creature had much travail with divers fellows and helpers to gather many old Bibles, and other doctors and common glosses, and to make one Latin Bible some deal true; and then to study it off the new text with the gloss and other doctors as he might get and specially *Lyra** on the Old Testament that helped him full much in this work; the third time to counsel with old grammarians and old divines of hard words and hard senses how they might best be understood and translated; the fourth time to translate as clearly as he could to the sense and to have many good fellows and cunning at the correcting of the translation.

It would seem tolerably certain from the above extract that the writer had no knowledge of any previous translation, and this is quite inconsistent with the idea that it was the work of one so intimately connected with Wyclif as Purvey was; that is always supposing that Wyclif had any part in the first version. It is hardly likely, moreover, that the author of the second version, were he an ardent follower of Wyclif, would

* At the top of fol. 1, Royal MS., i. C. ix., is the note "Here beginneth ye bible playnly the text: and where that eny maner clause is set in ye text and is not thereof Lire certifieth it plainly."

have manifested such scrupulous care to give the meaning of Holy Writ according to the interpretation of approved "doctors and common glosses."

We may now turn our attention to a brief consideration of the attitude of the English ecclesiastical authorities of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries towards a vernacular translation. It might seem unnecessary, perhaps, in these enlightened days to say much upon this; but the same old stories are being repeated almost daily, and writers of various kinds still indulge themselves in the congenial task of embellishing cherished traditions without caring to inquire too particularly, or for that matter at all, into the grounds of their belief. I have already referred to this attitude of mind, and I may here take as an example the writer of an article in the latest edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica":

The work of translating the Holy Scriptures (he says) assumed important dimensions mainly in connection with the spirit of revolt against the Church of Rome, which rose in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The study of the Bible in the vulgar tongue was a characteristic of the Cathari and Waldenses, and the whole weight of the Church's authority was turned against the use of the Scriptures by the laity. The prohibition of the Bible in the vulgar tongue, put forth at the Council of Toulouse in A.D. 1229, was repeated by other councils in various parts of the Church, but failed to quell the rising interest in the Scriptures. In England and in Bohemia the Bible was translated by the reforming parties of Wyclif and Huss; and the early presses of the fifteenth century sent forth Bibles not only in Latin, but in French, Spanish, Italian, German and Dutch.

We are, of course, concerned chiefly with England; but it may be useful to remark upon the misleading tendency of this passage from the "Encyclopædia." It has been shown beyond the possibility of doubt that in Germany there existed in the Middle Ages some seventy-two partial versions of the vernacular Scriptures and fifty complete translations, all emanating from Catholic sources. The same numerous translations existed also in France, with this difference, that, whilst most of the French manuscripts are *livres de luxe*, in Germany they appear to be small volumes, which point to their use as aids to personal piety rather than as books for mere library use. The same may also be said of the printed editions. France, Spain, and even Italy, each had editions of the vernacular Scriptures

in the fifteenth century, as some of the earliest efforts of their national printing presses. In Germany, indeed, no fewer than seventeen such editions existed before the time of Luther, and still people may yet be found who cling to the old fable of the accidental finding of the Bible by the so-called German reformer; the truth being that there is ample evidence to show that in making his translation of the Scriptures he had before him and was actually using one of these Catholic versions.

If England did not possess a pre-Reformation printed Bible this was due to circumstances to which I shall have to refer later. It should, moreover, be borne in mind that its place was supplied by the extremely popular "Golden Legend," which contained nearly the whole of the Pentateuch and the Gospel narrative in English, and which was issued from the press by Caxton before the close of the fifteenth century.

As to the attitude of the ecclesiastical authorities in England towards the translated Scriptures, it is believed on all hands, apparently, that it was uncompromisingly hostile. To judge from our ordinary history books we should certainly conclude that what Mr. Matthew calls "the zeal of the inquisitor" prevented any large circulation of the newly translated word of God. Yet a strange fact confronts us at the outset: the number of manuscript copies of English Bibles extant, hardly falls short of that of the German and French vernacular translations, which it is admitted were allowed. It has, I believe, been hitherto taken for granted without sufficient examination that the authority of the Church in this country was directed not merely to discourage the reading of the Bible in English, but absolutely to forbid the making of any translation whatever. But what, again, are the facts? As a proof of this distinct prohibition of the English Church, a constitution of the Council of Oxford in A.D. 1408 under Archbishop Arundel is usually relied upon. This is what the council has to say upon the matter:

It is dangerous, as Saint Jerome declares, to translate the text of Holy Scripture out of one idiom into another, since it is not easy in translations to preserve exactly the same meaning in all things. We therefore command and ordain that henceforth no one translate the text of Holy Scripture into English or any other language as a book, booklet or tract, and that no one read any book, booklet or tract of this kind lately made in the time of the said John Wyclif or since, or

that hereafter may be made either in part or wholly, either publicly or privately, under pain of excommunication until *such translation shall have been approved and allowed by the diocesan of the place, or (if need be) by the Provincial Council.* He who shall act otherwise let him be punished as an abettor of heresy and error.

Now it is obvious from the words of the decree that in this there is no such absolute prohibition as is generally represented. All that the fathers of the Synod of Oxford forbade was unauthorised translations. The fact that no mention is made of any Wycliffite translation of the entire Bible is not without its significance, and in view of the Lollard errors then prevalent and of the ease with which the text of Holy Scripture could be modified in the translation in any and every MS., so as apparently to be made to support those views, the ordinance appears not only prudent and just, but necessary. Even when the introduction of printing at last rendered it possible to secure that all copies should be identical, the version had still to be authorised. Beyond this safeguarding of the text the words of the decree seem to imply that proper authorisation might be obtained, and even that an official vernacular version of the Bible was seriously contemplated.

In this sense, there can be no doubt, the Constitution of Oxford was understood by those whom at the time it concerned. The great canonist Lyndewode in his gloss upon this passage says that the prohibition does not extend to translations of the Scripture made before the time of Wyclif, and he assigns the following as a reason why more recent translations must be approved, that :

Although it be the plain text of Sacred Scripture that is so translated, the translator may yet err in his translation, or if he compose a book, booklet, or tract, he may, as in fact frequently happens, intermingle false and erroneous teaching with the truth.

Sir Thomas More takes the same view, and specially denies that the church authorities in England had ever prohibited the making of English translations of the Bible or the reading of such when made.

For as much (he writes) as it is dangerous to translate the text of Scripture out of one tongue into another, as Holy St. Jerome testifyeth, for as much as in translation it is hard always to keep the same sentence (*i.e.*, sense) whole. It is, I say, for these causes at a counsaile holden at

Oxenford provyded upon great pain, that no man should from thenceforth translate into the English tongue, or any other language, of his own authority, by way of book, libellus or treatise, nor no man openly, or secretly, read any such book, &c., *newly made* in the time of the said John Wiclif or since, &c., until such should be approved. And this is a law that so many so long have spoken of, and so few have in all this while sought to seek (or find out) whether they say the truth or no. For I trow that in this law you see nothing unreasonable. For it neither forbiddeth the translations to be read that were *already well done of old before* Wyclif's days, nor dammeth his because it was new, but because it was naught; nor prohibiteth new to be made, but provideth that they shall not be read if they be made amiss, till they be by good examination amended.

In a subsequent place the same authority says again that :

When the clergy, in the Constitution Provincial before mentioned, agreed that the English Bibles should remain, which were translated afore Wyclif's days, they consequently did agree that to have the Bible in English was no hurt.

Of course the further question arises as to the action of the ecclesiastical authorities subsequent to the Council of Oxford. On this matter one writer says that :

It appears by our Bishop's Registers, that by virtue of it (*i.e.*, the Constitution passed in the Council of Oxford) several men and women were afterwards condemned to be burnt, and forced to abjure, for the reading of the New Testament and learning the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, &c., and teaching them to others, of Dr. Wicklif's translation. This (the writer adds) one of our Church historians (namely Fuller) called in question the truth of, and argued against the facts, but, according to our author, quite wrongly.

Yet what—as far as they can be ascertained—are the facts ? In the first place let us confine our attention to the manuscript version of the English Scriptures, before the question was complicated by the attempted dissemination of the printed copies of Tyndale's English Testament in 1526.

During the fifteenth century the examinations of Lollards and those who were in any way suspected of a leaning towards Wycliffite doctrines were numerous and were conducted upon well recognised and well understood principles. The articles upon which the suspected were to be questioned are well known. In a copy to be seen among the Harleian MSS.* at the British Museum the interrogatories number

* Harl. MS. 2179, fol. 157.

thirty-four and embrace a great variety of points of Christian faith and practice. The subject of the vernacular Scriptures is, however, not so much as raised in any of them. Further, in the very large number of recorded examinations of people charged with holding Lollard opinions, and in the various abjurations made by all classes of people condemned for their heretical opinions, which I have been able personally to examine, I have met with but one or at most two references to the Sacred Scriptures in English. Take an example. In 1469 one John Turner of Sidney abjured, amongst other errors of which he had been convicted, the following: "that religious people from mere envy prevent lay persons having the Holy Scripture translated into the English language."* As John Turner retracted this opinion we may take it that in some sense or other the assertion was untrue. For the rest the many examinations, the record of which exist, reveal the fact that the followers of Wyclif could never have made any very special point of their determination at all costs to have the Sacred Scriptures in English. Had they done so some evidence would have been forthcoming in their examinations before the ecclesiastical courts. This is, moreover, exactly what we should expect, since in no well recognised work of Wyclif is any stress laid upon the Bible in the vernacular, beyond what some may consider to be implied in his general claim to have the Scripture as his sole rule of faith, as I have before pointed out.

It is frequently asserted that all copies of the English Scriptures that fell into the hands of the ecclesiastical authorities were destroyed. Sir Thomas More says that "if this were done so, it were not well done; but," he continues in reply to one who had asserted this, "I believe that ye mistake it." And taking up one case objected against him in which the Bible of a Lollard prisoner named Richard Hun, a London merchant, was said to have been burnt in the Bishop of London's prison, he says:

This I remember well, that besides other things framed for the favour of divers other heresies there were in the prologue of that Bible such

* Foxe, "Acts and Monuments" (ed. Townsend), iii., 539, records an instance of Ralph Mungin, in 1416, being charged with having "The Gospels of John Wyclif," whatever that may mean.

words touching the Blessed Sacrament as good Christian men did abhor to hear and that gave the readers undoubted occasion to think that the book was written after Wyclif's copy and by him translated into our tongue, and that this Bible was destroyed consequently not because it was in English, but because it contained gross and manifest heresy.

This is borne out by the account given by Foxe, who has printed from the Register of Fitzjames, Bishop of London, thirteen articles extracted from "the prologue" of Hun's "Great Book of the Bible." These were read to the people from the pulpit at Paul's Cross, and they were invited to come and examine the Bible for themselves in order to see that it contained these errors.* If this list of articles can be relied upon, and there is no reason to distrust the account, it bears out Sir Thomas More's contention that this "great Bible" must have been a Lollard production, although we shall look in vain in the edition of Wycliffite Scriptures published by Forshall and Madden for any trace of these errors.

Turning now from Ecclesiastical to State records, we find no mention whatever of the Bible, or indeed of any part of the Scriptures, among the fairly numerous entries regarding the works of Wyclif and his Lollard followers recorded on the Patent and Close Rolls. In the period from Richard II. to Henry VII. searches were frequently directed to be made for the works of these reforming spirits, but no mention whatever is made in the orders for such quests of any translation of the Holy Scriptures. The usual form is much as follows: The King directs his sheriffs and other officers to search out and seize "all books, booklets, *cedulæ* and *quaterni*, compiled either in English or Latin, containing conclusions or wicked opinions contrary to the teaching of Holy Church." So careful were the authorities to carry out these instructions, that on the first intimation of any suspected centre of Lollard opinions the house was to be thoroughly searched to see "whether any English book, the reading of which was forbidden, could be found."†

From the absolute silence of all records, both ecclesiastical and lay, as to any Wycliffite version of the Bible, it may be fairly argued that the determination at all costs to spread the

* Foxe, "Acts and Monuments," iv. p. 186.

† Harl. MS., 2179, f. 158.

Scriptures in English formed no part of the practical politics of the Wycliffites. After this it need perhaps hardly be added that the rigour with which they were treated by Church and State authorities was in no sense caused by this lofty aspiration to propagate the gospel or any peculiar zeal manifested by them for the written word of God. The misunderstanding—to call it by its least objectionable name—is probably caused by certain circumstances relating to the first prints of the English Bible in the sixteenth century, upon which it is well here to make some brief remarks.

The difficulty first arose about 1526, when the translation of the New Testament, which had been made on the Continent by Tyndale, assisted by an ex-Friar, named William Roye, was first brought into England. Their object, as described by the learned Cochläus, who professes to have first-hand information, was that they “entertained hopes, that in a short time, through the New Testament, which they had translated into English, all the people of England would become Lutherans, whether the King would or no.” Whether this was the case or not does not greatly matter, since it is allowed on all hands that the version so printed was gravely, if not grossly, corrupt. “In some editions of Tyndale’s *New Testament*,” writes the Protestant historian Blunt, “there is what must be regarded as a wilful omission of the gravest possible character, for it appears in several editions and has no shadow of justification in the Greek or Latin of the passage (i. Peter, 11, 13, 14). Such an error was quite enough” to justify the suppression of Tyndale’s translation. That this infidelity was in truth the real reason for its condemnation clearly appears in the monition addressed by Tunstall, at that time Bishop of London, to the archdeacons of his diocese.

Some sons of iniquity and ministers of the Lutheran faction (he writes) have craftily translated the Holy Gospels of God into our vulgar English and intermingled with their translation articles gravely heretical and opinions that are erroneous, pernicious, pestilent, scandalous and tending to seduce persons of simple and unwary dispositions.

For this reason he orders that every copy of the translation that could be found or detected should be forthwith delivered up to his officers.*

* Commission dated October 24, 1526.

For some years after this ecclesiastical prohibition of Tyndale's translation, demands were from time to time made for an authorised printed version. It is open to us in these days perhaps to regret that no measure to satisfy this want was taken in due time by the Catholic bishops; but their reason for delaying the production was the substantial fear that it would only tend further to spread the ever increasing flood of erroneous opinions. As the royal proclamation "against translating the Bible in English, French, or Dutch," issued in 1530, says:

Having respect to the malignity of this present time, with the inclination of the people to erroneous opinions (it is thought) that the translation of the New Testament and the Old into the vulgar tongue of England would rather be the occasion of continuance or increase of errors among the said people than any benefit or commodity towards the weal of their souls, and that it shall be now more convenient that the same people have the Holy Scripture expounded to them by preachers in their sermons as it hath been of old time accustomed.

For these reasons all are ordered to deliver up the copies of the printed Testament "corruptly translated into the English tongue," the King promising "to provide that the holy Scripture shall be, by great learned and Catholique persons, translated into the English tongue, if it shall then seem to his grace convenient to be."*

The postponement of this promised issue was not decided upon without due consideration, and those who lived at the time and may be considered as likely best to understand the circumstances imputed no blame to Archbishop Warham and the English ecclesiastical authorities generally for their continued opposition to the scheme. Even Cranmer himself says: "I can wel think them worthie pardon, which at the comming abrode of the Scripture doubted and drew backe." On this point it has been well remarked, by the way, that there was no such general desire to have a vernacular Bible in England, as is commonly represented. Except among a small minority of interested persons, who saw in these translations a possible means of spreading their "new doctrines, England was certainly not a Bible-thirsty land."†

* Wilkins, "Concilia." iii. 741.

† J. R. Dore, "Old Bibles," p. 13.

After this brief digression which was necessary to explain the attitude of the English bishops in the early part of the sixteenth century towards the printed vernacular Scriptures, we may return to the question of the manuscript versions. We are now in a position to consider the fourth point of our inquiry, namely: What evidence, if any, is there for the existence of a Catholic and Orthodox version? So far as I am aware, every one who has dealt with the subject of the English Scriptures, has taken for granted that there was none. But in the first place we are confronted with the distinct claim put forward by Sir Thomas More. Besides expressly denying that there was any general prohibition of the English Bible, he asserts that there was an undoubted Catholic edition well known in his days.

As for old translacions, before Wycliffe's time (he writes) they remain lawful and be in some folkes handes. Myself have seen and can show you, Bybles, fair and olde, in English which have been known and seen by the Byshoppe of the Diocese and left in laymanes hands and womenes.

Again, in another place he says:

The whole byble was long before his (*i.e.*, Wyclif's) days by vertuous and well learned men, translated into the English tongue and by good and godly people with devotion, and soberness, wel and reverently red.*

It may, I think, be justly argued that, although Sir Thomas More may have been wrong in assigning the manuscript copies of the version he knew as the authorised Catholic one, to a date prior to the age of Wyclif, he cannot have been wrong as to the *fact* of the existence in his days of well-known and approved copies of the Bible in English.

This evidence is corroborated by Archbishop Cranmer himself, who, in the prologue to the second edition of the great Bible, writes in defence of the Scriptures in English thus:

If the matter shoulde be tried by custome, wee might also alledge custome for the reading of the scripture in the vulgar tongue, and prescribe the more ancient custome. For it is not much above one hundred yeaere ago, since scripture hath not been accustomed to be read in the vulgar tongue within this realme, and many hundred yeaeres before that, it was translated and read in the Saxon's tongue, whiche at that tyme was our mother tongue * * and when this language waxed olde and out

* "Dyalogues" (ed. 1530), p. 138.

of common usage, bycause folke should not lacke the fruit of reading, it was again translated into the newer language, whereof yet also many copies remayne and be dayly founde.

These copies, it is hardly necessary to remark, the writer must have regarded as authorised translations, and it must have been one of these that he took as the basis of his projected print of the Bible in 1535, dividing it into nine or ten parts, which he submitted to various bishops for their correction.*

The same testimony—so far at least as regards the existence of vernacular versions of the Scriptures independent of John Wyclif's—is given by Foxe, the martyrologist. In his dedication to Archbishop Parker of his edition of the Saxon Gospels he writes :

If histories be well examined we shall find both before the Conquest and after, as well before John Wickliffe was borne as since the whole body of the Scriptures was by sundry men translated into our country tongue.

In the face then of so much distinct evidence, it is extremely difficult not to admit the existence in pre-Reformation days of some well recognised and perfectly orthodox version or versions of the Holy Scriptures in English.†

Now the question at once arises, What has become of the Catholic version known to Sir Thomas More, Archbishop Cranmer, and John Foxe? If we are to accept the conclusions of those who have hitherto written on the subject, we know of but two English manuscript versions of the entire Bible, those which are now called the Lollard Scriptures, and as such they are printed in Forshall and Madden's great edition. Of any other—that is, any Catholic version—we are asked to believe that there is now no trace whatever. But, I would ask, may it not be possible that under the influence of a preconceived idea people have gone off on a wrong scent altogether? If we start with a foregone conclusion, we can have little hope that we shall read facts rightly, even though they be as plain as the proverbial pikestaff, and in this instance it appears to me that it has been assumed altogether too hastily that the English

* Strype, "Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer" (ed. 1812), i. p. 42.

† The writer of the article on the "Vernacular Bible" in the *Encyclopædia* (9th ed.), viii. p. 381, *seqq.* suggests that "the many copies spoken of by Cranmer disappeared in the destruction of the monastic libraries."

pre-Reformation Scriptures could not have been Catholic, and must have been and were the outcome of the Wycliffite movement. For myself I may say, that after much consideration I have been led to the belief that facts cannot be made to square with this theory as to the origin of the first versions of the English Bible. Startling as the assertion may seem to many, I have come to the conclusion that the versions, now known as the Wycliffite Scriptures, are in reality only authorised translations of the Catholic Bible. Every circumstance that can be gleaned regarding these manuscripts strengthens this belief. Whether Hereford or Purvey possibly (for at best we are, so far as this is concerned, dealing with possibilities) may have had any part in the translation does not, after all, so much concern us. Our chief interest is not with the translator, but with the work itself and with the question whether it may fairly be claimed as the semi-official and certainly perfectly orthodox translation of the English Church; or whether, on the other hand, it must be regarded as a version secretly executed, clandestinely circulated, and still more stealthily studied by the Lollard followers of Wyclif. This is the main point of interest.

Now, I hardly think it can be questioned that if we were to rely upon the testimony of our writers of history, and our so-called masters of English literature, we must accept the latter alternative, and regard the English Bible as the book which the Lollard followers of Wyclif made, multiplied and studied, and for which they died. Take the description in Taine's "History of English Literature":

Fancy (he writes) these brave spirits, simple and strong souls, who began to read at night in their shops, by candle-light, for they were shopkeepers, tailors, skimmers and bakers, who with some men of letters began to read and then to believe, and finally got themselves burned.*

So far as I have been able to discover, however, from an examination of the two texts, there is nothing inconsistent with their having been the work of perfectly orthodox sons of Holy Church. In no place, where (had the version been the work of Lollard pens) we might have looked for texts strained or glossed to suit their well-known conclusions, do any such

* Taine, "History of English Literature," i. p. 167.

appear. Sir Thomas More indeed, as we have already seen, speaks of a Bible that was destroyed because it contained "such words touching the Blessed Sacrament" that people took it for a Lollard Bible. This is quite what we should have expected, seeing that some verses, written about the reign of Henry VI., are inserted into a copy of Hampole's Psalter, charging the Lollards with having interpolated their special teaching into this work so as to claim for it the authority of the holy hermit. Apparently all such garbled Scriptures must have fallen into the hands of those officials, who rigorously sought for any scrap of Wycliffite writing, since such Bibles are not now known to exist.

I cannot but think that an unbiassed mind that will reflect upon the matter must see how impossible it was for a poor persecuted sect like the Lollards, for the writings of which frequent and rigid searches were made, to produce the Bibles now ascribed to them. Many of these copies, as we may see for ourselves, are written with great care and exactness, and illuminated with coloured borders executed by skilful artists. These must surely have been the productions of freer hands than the followers of Wyclif ever were allowed to have in England. The learned editors of the so-called Wycliffite Scriptures, Messrs. Forshall and Madden, apparently hardly appreciated the force of this when they wrote:

The new copies passed into the hands of all classes of the people. Even the sovereign himself and the princes of the blood royal did not disdain to possess them. The volumes were in many instances executed in a costly manner, and were usually written upon vellum by experienced scribes. This implies not merely the value which was set upon the word of God, but also that the scribes found a reward for their labours among the wealthier part of the community.*

This is undoubtedly the case, and it is to be explained only on the supposition that the English Bible thus widely circulated was in truth the authorised Catholic version, and was in the possession of its various owners with the thorough approval of the ecclesiastical authorities. Is it likely that men of position, of unquestioned orthodoxy, and of undoubted hostility to Lollard aims and opinions, would have cherished the possession of copies

* Introduction, p. xxxii.

of a Wycliffite Bible? When we find, for example, that a finely-executed vellum folio copy of the Scriptures with illuminated borders was not only the property of King Henry VI.—a monarch, by the way, of saintly life and “enthusiastic in the cause of religion”—but that he bestowed it upon the monks of the London Charterhouse, we cannot but acknowledge that this must have been known as the perfectly orthodox translation of the English Church.

The same version is found to have had a place in the royal library of Henry VII. In this copy not only is the excellent character of the workmanship altogether inconsistent with the notion that it is from the pen of some poor hunted adherent of Wyclif, but a leaf supplied at the beginning, in a late fifteenth century hand, is illuminated with the royal arms, the portcullis and red and white Tudor roses. Moreover, curiously enough, this border surrounds the prologue, *Five and Twenty Books*, so freely attributed to Wyclif.

A third copy of the English Scriptures—the very manuscript now displayed in the British Museum as Wyclife’s translation, to which I referred at the commencement of this paper—formerly belonged to Thomas Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, the firm friend and ally of that uncompromising opponent of Lollard opinions, Archbishop Arundel. Indeed, the inventory of the Duke of Gloucester’s goods, now in the Record Office, shows that, besides “the Bible in English in two big volumes bound in red leather,” he possessed in his by no means extensive library an English Psalter and two books of the Gospels in English.* Another copy of this version of the New Testament was the property of, and has the autograph of, Humphrey—“the good Duke Humphrey”—of Gloucester, the generous benefactor of St. Albans, and the constant friend of its abbot, Whethamstede, whose hostility to Lollard doctrines is well known.

Another point which must not be overlooked is the good Catholic company in which this version of the Scriptures, or parts of it, are occasionally found. Thus, in a volume in the Museum collection we find not only the lessons from the Old Testament read in the Mass Book, together with the table of

* R. O. Exch. Q. R. Escheator’s Accts. 77.

Epistles and Gospels, but a tract by Richard Rolle, "of amendinge of mannes life, or 'the rule of lifying,'" and another on contemplative life and love of God.* Another copy of *The Book of Tobit*, in the later version, which is followed by the translated *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*, has also in the volume some tracts or meditations, and what is called the "Pistle of Holy Sussanne." With this is bound, possibly at a later date, Richard Rolle of Hampole's *Craft of Deying*. The Catholic origin of this volume is borne out fully by the fact that it belonged to the convent of Barking in Essex. Indeed, it appears to have been written by one of the nuns named Matilda Hayle, as the note *Iste liber constat Matilde Hayle de Berkinge* is in the same hand as the body of the book, which, by the way, subsequently belonged to another nun named Mary Hastynges.†

A copy of the English Bible, now at Lambeth, formerly belonged to Bishop Bonner, that *Malleus hereticorum*, and another, now at Cambridge, to William Weston, the Prior of St. John's, Clerkenwell.

In like manner a copy of the English translation of the New Testament, now attributed to Wyclif, among the manuscripts of the Duke of Northumberland at Alnwick, was originally, and probably not long after the volume was written, the property of another religious. On the last page is the name of Katerina Methwold, *Monacha*—Katherine Methwold—the nun.

There are, moreover, instances of the English Bible—the production—the secret production of the Lollard scribes—that perilous piece of property to possess, as we are asked to believe—there are instances of this being bequeathed by wills publicly proved in the public courts of the bishops. Others, not less publicly, are bestowed upon churches or given to religious houses. It is of course obvious that this could never have been done had the volume so left been the work of Wyclif or of his followers, for it would then indeed have been, as a modern writer describes the Wycliffite books, "a perilous piece of property." Thus, before the close of the fourteenth century, namely in 1394, a copy of the Gospels in English was

* Lansdowne MS., 455.

† Add. MS., 10,596.

bequeathed to the chantry of St. Nicholas in the church of Holy Trinity, York, by John Hopton, chaplain there.* Fancy what this means on the theory that the English Scriptures were the work of Wycliffite hands! It means nothing less than that a Catholic priest publicly bequeaths, in a will proved in his bishop's court, to a Catholic church for the use of Catholic people the prescribed work of some member of an heretical sect!

Again, in 1404, Philip Baunt, a Bristol merchant, leaves by will a copy of the Gospels in English to a priest named John Canterbury, attached to St. Mary Redcliffe's Church. And—not to mention many cases in wills of the period, where it is probable that the Bible left was an English copy—there is an instance of a bequest of such a Bible in the will of a priest, William Revetour, of York, in 1446. The most interesting gift of an English New Testament, as a precious and pious donation to the church, is that of the copy now in the possession of Lord Ashburnham,† which in 1517 was given to the Convent of our Lady of Syon by Lady Danvers. On the last page is the following dedication :

Good Mr. Confessor of Sion with his brethren. Dame Anne Danvers widowe, sometyme wyffe to Sir William Danvers, knyght (whose soul God assoyle) hathe gebyn this present Booke unto Mastre Confessor and his Brethren enclosed in Syon, entendyng therby not oonly the honor laude and preysse to Almighty God but also that she the moore tenderly may be committed unto the mercy of God.

The aforeseid Dame Anne Danvers hathe delyvered this booke by the hands of her son Thomas Danvers on Mydde Lent Sunday in the 8th yere (of our lord King Henry VIII. and in the yere) of our Lord God a M. fyve hundred and seventeene. Deo gracias.

To all who know what Syon was; how for a century past it had represented the very pink of pious orthodoxy and was the centre of the devotional life of the period; how the practical piety of its sisters was fostered by the highest ascetical teaching of Richard Whytford and others; to all who understand this it must appear as nothing less than the height of absurdity to suppose that any lady would insult its inmates by offering for their acceptance an heretical version of the English Bible.

* Surtees Soc. *Testamenta Ebor*, i. 196.

† Ashburnham MS., Appendix xix. (No. 156 in Forshall and Madden). The text of this MS. was printed for Mr. Lea Wilson by Pickering in 1848.

And, whilst on the subject of Syon, attention must be called to another very important piece of evidence for the existence of a Catholic version of the Scriptures. It is contained in a devotional book, written probably not later than the year 1450 for the use of these sisters of Syon, and printed "at the desyre and instaunce of the worshypfull and devoute lady abbesse* of the worshypful Monastery of Syon and the reverende fadre in God† general confessor of the same" about the year 1530. It is called *The Myrroure of our Lady very necessary for religious persons*, and it is practically a translation of their church services into English to enable the nuns the better to understand their daily ecclesiastical duties. The point to which attention is directed is the following paragraph in the "first prologue," written, remember, not later than the middle of the fifteenth century: "Of psalms I have drawn (*i.e.*, translated) but fewe," says the author, "for ye may have them of Richard Hampoules drawinge, and out of *Englysshe bibles* if ye have lysence therto."‡ It is not very likely that these pious sisters would have been able to get their psalms from Wycliffite versions.

To pass to another point: it has been remarked upon as somewhat strange that in Wyclif's sermons, which seem to have been written at the close of his life, the Scripture quotations are in no case made from the version now declared to be his. A preacher, of course, may have turned the Latin into English at the moment; but in his case this is hardly likely if, as we are given to understand, the popularising of his reputed version was the great object of his life. Moreover, what may well have been the case in spoken discourses would scarcely have been adhered to in written and formal sermons. Beyond this the same is true of every work reputed to be Wyclif's. In no instance does he quote his own supposed version. On the other hand it is at least most remarkable that the Commentary upon the Apocalypse, formerly attributed to Wyclif, but which is now acknowledged not to be from his pen, has the ordinary version for its text.

Further, it is not without significance that Bishop Pecock in his "Repressor," a work written ostensibly against the position

* Dame Agnes Jordan, the last abbesse.

† John Fewterer, who also survived the Dissolution.

‡ "The Myrroure of oure Ladye" (ed. J. H. Blunt), E. Eng. Text Soc., p. 3.

of the Lollards and their claim to make the Sacred Scripture their sole and sufficient guide in all things, not only uses what is now called the Wycliffite version of the Bible in all his quotations, but throughout his tract evidently takes for granted that the lay-folk generally had the Scriptures with authority, and nowhere blames the fact. Moreover, he is careful to explain that he only speaks of the Lollards as "Biblemen," because of their wish to found every law of faith and morals on the written Word.

This what I have now said (he concludes) of and to Bible men I have not said under this intent and meaning that I should feel to be unlawful (for) laymen for to read in the Bible and for to study and learn therein, with help and counsel of wise and well learned clerks and with license of ther governor and bishop.*

And here we may note that this authorisation of the Scriptures, to which several references have been made, was in fact sometimes at least given. The Council of Oxford had laid down the law that the version must be "approved and allowed" by those in authority. Bishop Pecock, in the passage above quoted, speaks of this "license of their governor and bishop," and Sir Thomas More declares that such approbation might be obtained without difficulty. When the Hours B. V. M., which Caxton printed in A.D. 1500, were first translated about thirty years previously, the translator informs us that for his version of the Psalms he "asked and obtained the necessary permission from his bishop."† Another example of what apparently is an approbation is to be seen in one of Lord Ashburnham's manuscript copies of the New Testament. The writing I refer to is unfortunately hardly legible. It is, however, certainly to be dated in the fifteenth century, and probably is hardly much later than the writing in the main part of the book. What can be read runs as follows: "A lytel boke of—£8 6s. 8d., and it (was written by) a holy man (and) was overseyne and read by Dr. Thomas Ebb-all and Dr. Ryve . . . my modir bought it." We have here then a mere chance record of the fact that this particular copy of the New Testament had been "overseen and read" by two learned doctors, deputed, it is

* R. Pecock, "The Repressor of over much Blaming of the Clergy" (ed. Rolls Series), i. p. 37.

† "Speculum B. Virginis," in Wharton, *Auctarium*, p. 448.

hardly too much to conclude, by rightful authority for the purpose. This, by the way, is of course a copy of the later of the two versions now known as Wycliffite Scriptures.

To this instance we may add that the historian Strype records of Archbishop Arundel that he "was for the translation of the Scriptures into the vulgar tongue, and for the laity's use thereof." This he deduces from the testimony of an old manuscript written apparently at the time of the death of Anne of Bohemia, the consort of King Richard II. in 1392.

Also the Bishop of Canterbury, Thomas of Arundel, that now is (runs the record), preached a sermon at Westminster, whereat there were many hundred people, at the burying of Queer Anne (on whose soul God have mercy), and in his commendation of her he said that it was more joy of her than of any woman that ever he knew. For notwithstanding that she was an alien born she had in English all the four Gospels, with the doctors upon them. And he said that she sent them unto him, and he said that they were good and true and commended her, in that she was so great a Lady and also an alien and would study such holy, such virtuous books.*

There is one curious piece of evidence which seems to point to the conclusion that the archbishops and clergy of England at one time actually proposed that Parliament should sanction an approved vernacular translation. The point in question is referred to in a strange old contemporary tract printed by John Foxe. The writer there says :

Also it is known to many men that into a Parliament, in the time of King Richard II., there was put a Bible, by the assent of the archbishops and of the clergy, to annul the Bible at that time translated into English with other English books of the exposition of the Gospel.

Apparently this project was opposed by John of Gaunt, and it came to nothing. I am, of course, aware that Foxe and subsequent writers have spoken of this as a Bill introduced by Archbishop Arundel to put down the newly-translated English Bible, but the tract clearly says it was a "Bible" proposed by the clergy to take the place of some unauthorised version, and the whole argument of the writer of the tract requires that this should be his meaning.†

Another not unimportant point in the evidence which goes

* Strype, "Memorials of Cranmer" (ed. 1812), i. p. 3.

† Foxe, "Acts and Monuments" (ed. Townsend), iv. p. 674.

to show that the vernacular versions, now known as Wycliffite, are in reality perfectly orthodox and authorised is the fact that most of the copies now extant are intended for use in the church.

Lewis long ago noticed * that the Anglo-Saxon translation was divided into sections over which was placed a rubric directing when it should be read. For instance, Matthew i. 18 is prefaced by the following in Anglo-Saxon: "This Gospel is to be read on Midwinter's mass eve." This, that writer says, "I think a good proof that at this time the Holy Scriptures were read in the public service of the church in a language which the people understood." He failed, however, to remark that the same may be said of the English version. Most of the extant copies will be found marked for the Lessons, Epistles and Gospels, and a good many are prefaced by a table "or rule that tellith" in which chapters of the Bible "ye maye fynde the lessons, &c., that ben red in the chirche all the yeer aftir the use of Salisbirie."† Some of the manuscripts are in fact merely books of the Epistles and Gospels from the New Testament in this English version to which, that there might be no doubt about their use in connection with church purposes, there are added the portions of the Old Testament read at times in the mass. To some copies of the entire New Testament these portions of the Old have been added. One copy of the older version (Harl. MS., 1710) is an excellent example of a fourteenth-century Gospel book, giving the parts of Scripture "as they ben red in the messe booke after ye use of Salisberi." Its actual connection with the Church services is further shown by its giving, on folio 15, "Ye Gospel at Matynes on twelfth day," and, on folio 9, a long rubric as to the chaunting of a portion of the office: "Ye first verse and ye last by two togidere but all ye myddel verse one syngeth only." This book belonged, by the way, to "Sir Roger Lyne, chantry prest of Saynt Swythyn's at London Stone." And this, says the maker of the Harleian Catalogue, "is a sort of proof that in times of Popery, the reading God's word in our mother-tongue was not denied by authority."

I am aware that it is not generally considered probable

* "History of the English Translations of the Bible," p. 10.

† Harl. MS., 4890, f. 1.

that the Epistles and Gospels were read in the vernacular as well as in Latin at the mass. But I cannot myself doubt that this was done, frequently if not ordinarily. Such a course so obviously advantageous, was, as we know, advised by Bishop Grosseteste, not to mention others, and was at least sometimes done, as we know from specific instances. The existence of prones on the Gospels of Sundays and Feast days—some of them very early—in which the whole of the Gospel is translated and afterwards explained, is well known, and to me these marked copies of the English Scriptures and English Epistle and Gospel books are additional proof that the practice was more common than some writers are inclined to allow.

There is not even a shadow of probability in the suggestion that Wycliffite Scriptures would be marked for the Church services for the use of his “poor priests.” The truth is that these same “poor priests” had in fact little claim to any sacerdotal character. They are described by Professor Shirley as mere *lay* preachers, both “coarse and ignorant.”* The few priests who were attracted at the beginning of the “Reformer’s” career by his bold and withal brilliant attacks upon the ecclesiastical order, quickly returned to the bosom of the Church. “In this, therefore,” writes the same author, “the most essential point of his whole system (independence of authority) he was unable to count on retaining the support of any but a few presumptuous fanatics, the ‘fools who rushed in where angels fear to tread.’”† The assumption, then, that these copies of the vernacular Bible were marked with the passages of Holy Scripture used in the Sarum Missal, to assist the Lollard preachers is, in view of these laymen having no connection whatever with the Church or its services, of their having no special veneration, to put it mildly, for the mass in general, or “the use of Salisbury” in particular, without the slightest foundation in fact.

Let me now sum up very briefly. I have neither the wish nor the intention to deny that Wyclif *may* have had something to do with the translation of the Bible into English. My concern is with the actual versions of the translated Scriptures now known to us. Two, and only two, such pre-Reformation

* *Fusciculus Zizaniorum*, Introduction, p. xl.

† *Ibid.*, p. lxvii.

vernacular versions are in existence. These have hitherto been ascribed unhesitatingly to Wyclif or his followers, and are known to all under the title of the Wycliffite Scriptures, as printed by Messrs. Forshall and Madden. It will be observed that the ascription of these translations to Wyclif is not based on positive testimony; but, when the case is looked into, it really depends on the tacit assumption that there was no Catholic version at all. I desire rather to insist on this point, because to many it may seem more than strange that after the immense amount of labour that has been spent upon these manuscripts I should come forward with a theory that runs absolutely counter to the conclusions of many most learned and estimable men. But, if I mistake not, these same conclusions have been formed without any consideration of an alternative. Accordingly, no practical need has been felt by writers who have dealt with the subject to consider a number of facts, which in themselves constitute grave difficulties against the theory of the Wycliffite origin of these versions, and they have, in the circumstances naturally, perhaps, been allowed to lie dormant. But, as I have pointed out, there seems no possibility of denying the existence in pre-Reformation times of a Catholic and allowed version of the English Bible. At once, therefore, all these difficulties rise into life and must be faced honestly if the truth is to be reached. For my own part, having looked into the matter with some care, I do not see how it is possible to come to any other conclusion than this: that the versions of the Sacred Scriptures, edited by Messrs. Forshall and Madden, and commonly known as Wycliffite, are in reality the Catholic versions of our pre-Reformation forefathers.

F. A. GASQUET.

Science Notices.

The Cloud Exhibition of the Royal Meteorological Society.
—The Classification of Clouds.—The Annual Exhibition of the Royal Meteorological Society, held in April last, treated of the representation and measurement of clouds, and from its pictorial nature was perhaps of wider interest than many of the previous exhibitions. Several beautiful photographs of clouds were shown, the specimens being collected from all parts of the world. Some were taken by Mons. Paul Garnier at the observatory at Boulogne-sur-Seine, others came from the Santis Observatory, Switzerland. Mr. H. C. Russell exhibited a series of six photographs representing the cloud formation during a thunderstorm at Sydney on May 31. There were also on view clouds taken at the Vatican Observatory. Mr. Clayden exhibited clouds taken by reflection from a black glass mirror. In this process he places the mirror in front of the lens so that the plane of the mirror makes an angle of about 33° with the axis of the lens. As the mirror extinguishes the polarised light, the image of the cloud stands out brightly on a dark ground.

Perhaps the most curious photographs shown were the “Festooned Cumulus,” being part of a storm cloud which passed over Sydney, New South Wales, January 18, 1893, and the two photographs exhibited by Mr. H. C. Russell depicting the clouds preceding the “Southerly Burster” at Sydney on November 13, 1893, six P.M., and the peculiar effect of the cloud-roll of the Southerly Burster an hour later on the same day.

The photographs of Tornado clouds were also very curious. Two of these were taken at Jamestown, Dakota, June 6, 1887, when the cloud-funnel was twelve miles to the north, and one was taken in the storm of June 22, 1888, and shows the spiral-shaped funnel trailing at a considerable altitude in the air at the other side of a lake, New Hampshire, U.S.

In addition to the pictorial nature of the exhibition, there were several instruments on view for ascertaining the direction and height of clouds. Amongst these were nephoscopes for finding out the direction of the motion of clouds. The principle in the various types exhibited is the same. There is a circular mirror with radial or parallel lines marked on it. The points of the compass are marked on the outside of the frames. To find the direction of the motion of

a cloud, the mirror is turned on its axis until the image of the cloud passes along one of the lines. An ingenious instrument for determining the height, rate, and direction of motion from photographs, is the one designed by Sir G. G. Stokes. Photographs of a cloud are taken at the same time by two cameras placed at each end of a measured base, another set is taken at an interval of about two minutes. A print of one of the four negatives thus obtained is placed upon a sheet of paper upon which cross lines have been ruled to allow of the pictures being properly adjusted, and with a needle a prick is made through the position of the point of the cloud which has been selected for measurement. The process is repeated for each of the other pictures of the set. The sheet of paper containing four holes is placed over the square aperture in the diaphragm of the instrument, which is placed at a distance from the lens at the end equal to the focal length of the camera lens. Another sheet of paper is then placed on the moveable board beyond the diaphragm, which by means of the divided arc attached to it is set to the zenith distance of the cameras at the time the photographs were taken. This instrument is then placed so that a strong light passes through the lens on to the diaphragm and four spots of light are formed upon the paper on the boards, which being joined will form a parallelogram, two opposite sides of which will give the drift of the cloud on the same scale as the other two sides represent the distance between the two cameras. The direction of the drift is easily obtained from the position of the one pair of sides relatively to the other, the latter being parallel to the measured base the bearings of which are known. The product of the distance from the lens to the board and the length of the measured base in feet, divided by the length of the side of the parallelogram parallel to the base, gives the height of the cloud in feet.

An interesting feature of the exhibition were two sketches by the late Luke Howard, whose well-known classification of clouds is in general use at the present time. One of these depicts clouds gathering for a thunderstorm and represents a sky full of the peculiar forms assumed by the clouds when gathering for a thunderstorm, the other represents the commencement of a stratus. The evening mist creeps as it rises through the valley to become shortly a dense body of cloud resting with a level surface on the ground like a lake of water and possibly on the morrow covering the country with fog.

The closer study of cloud phenomena afforded by modern photography has suggested to several meteorologists that the time has come for a wider classification of their varieties than the one estab-

lished by Luke Howard. Mr. Gaster recently suggested a method for a new classification to the Royal Meteorological Society. In this he recognises that there are only two main classes of cloud forms: (1) those which arrange themselves in the form of sheets, whose vertical measurements are small when compared with the horizontal, to which he applies the general term *stratus* and *stratiform*; (2) those which rise up in heaps like masses of cotton wool and form an horizontal base, to which he applies the terms *cumulus* and *cumuliform*. To describe the varieties of these main classes he supplements them with certain characteristic prefixes and affixes such as the following: *Detached*, applying to sheet clouds when the sheet is broken up into a number of more or less rounded cloudlets, such as is found in the conventional *cirro-cumulus* cloud. *Fracto*, applied to clouds or portions of them with ragged edges, bearing the appearance of having been broken off roughly from a larger mass, or of having their outline broken or torn owing to some atmospheric disturbance. *Turreted*, when portions of the cloud rise abruptly from a base in a turret-like form at considerable distances from one another. *Mammati*, when instead of the rounded portion of certain clouds rising upwards from the base they hang downwards, instances of this occurring both in *stratiform* and *cumuliform* clouds. *Furrowed*, applied to certain forms of clouds the under surface of which is in ridges, as though it had been ploughed as a field. *Cirriiform*, applied to those clouds which, while appearing as sheets, have a distinct filamentary structure either in right or curvilinear lines, or take the form of feathers.

He arranges the cloud forms under four headings: 1. Surface clouds which appear commonly between the earth's surface and a cloud level of about 2,000 ft., at which altitude the bases of some of the *cumulo-nimbi* are sometimes found. 2. Lower medium clouds commonly found at an altitude varying from 2,000 to about 10,000 ft. from the earth. 3. Higher medium clouds including all varieties which usually float at an elevation ranging from 10,000 to about 22,000 ft. 4. Highest level or *cirriiform* clouds found commonly at elevations exceeding 22,000 ft. Mr. Ley has raised two objections to Mr. Gaster's proposed classification: 1. That the nomenclature is non-international, English words doing duty side by side with classical ones. 2. That it is unscientific. He thinks that a new classification should rest on differences of physical processes, such as simple radiation from the earth, dust particles, convection currents, the over-lapping of currents differing in velocity, direction, or both, the adiabatic effects of condensation and of congelation on the forms of clouds.

But whatever may be the basis of the new classification, as Mr. Gaster has pointed out, a closer observation is very desirable for obtaining a direct knowledge of the movements of the higher wind currents over level country. "Once let us be possessed of good cloud observations, taken by a fairly numerous body of observers scattered over the country, observing simultaneously, and using the same terms when referring to identical forms, there must of necessity be a development of our knowledge of the atmospheric circulation both in cyclonic and anticyclonic systems, which cannot fail to be of the utmost value to meteorologists and to the world at large."

Turacin.—The animal pigment Turacin, discovered by Professor A. H. Church, possesses several remarkable features. It is the red colouring matter in the wing feathers of a plantain eater. This colouring matter is soluble in water, but Professor Church found that a better way of separating the pigment was to use dilute ammonia as the solvent, and to precipitate by adding hydrochloric acid in excess. After precipitation the separated colouring matter is filtered off, washed and dried. The product obtained is a solid of a dark, bloodlike crimson hue, not crystalline, and having a purple semi-metallic lustre. The name Turacin is taken from "Touraco," the appellation by which the plantain eaters are known, *Turacus* being the most extensive genus of this family of birds. Professor Church expected to find iron in this pigment, but on testing for it got a precipitate of Prussian brown indicating the presence of copper in larger proportions. For some time the announcement of the presence of copper in an animal pigment was viewed with some scepticism, and it was suggested that it must have been derived from the Bunsen burner used in incineration, or from some preservative solution applied to the bird skins. But independent observers had occasion to confirm the professor's opinion that as concentrated hydrochloric acid removes no copper from turacin even on boiling, the metal present could not have been a mere casual impurity, and as the proportion is constant in the turacin, the existence of a single definite compound is indicated.

Professor Church thinks the source of the copper is in the food of the bird. The presence of the metal has been found in a very large number of plants, and it can be readily detected in the ash of banana fruits, the favourite food of several species of the "turacin bearers." The feathers of a bird contain about two grains of turacin, corresponding to .14 of a grain of metallic copper. As the professor states, this is not a large amount to be furnished by its food to one of these birds once annually during the season of the renewal of its

feathers. It is curious that when the blood and tissues of one of these birds was examined immediately after death there were only faint traces of copper.

The pigment is not found in all the genera of plantain eaters, but only in three out of the six—the *Turacus*, *Gallirex*, and *Musophaga*. In all the birds in which the pigment occurs it is confined to the red parts of the web, and is unaccompanied by other colouring matter. It is therefore found that if a single barb from a feather is analysed its black base and its black termination contains no copper, while the intermediate portion gives the blue-green flash of copper when incinerated in the Bunsen flame; where it occurs turacin is homogeneously distributed in the barbs, barbicels and crochets of the web, and is not in granules or corpuscles.

Professor Church has naturally made a search for this pigment in other birds, but at present without success, though he has sought for it in scores of birds which are more or less nearly related to the plantain eaters. In some of the latter, however, he has found a second pigment closely related to turacin, of a dark grass-green colour, which is probably identical with the green pigment into which turacin when moist is converted by long exposure to the air, or by ebullition with soda. Turacin is a colloid, and shares in a high degree the peculiar property of colloids of retaining when freshly precipitated an immense proportion of water. When its solution in ammonia is precipitated by an acid, the coagulum formed is very voluminous, one grain of turacin is capable of forming a semi-solid mass with 600 grains of water. Like other colloids it is soluble in pure water, and is insoluble in the presence of mere traces of saline matter. The effect of heating turacin is remarkable. At 100° and at much higher temperatures it undergoes no modification, but when heated to the boiling point of mercury its character is changed.

No vapours are evolved, but the substance becomes black and is no longer soluble in alkaline liquids, nor when still more strongly heated afterwards can it be made to yield the purple vapours which unchanged turacin gives off under the same circumstances. This peculiarity of turacin caused great difficulty in its analysis, for these purple vapours contain an organic crystalline compound in which both nitrogen and copper are present, and which resist further decomposition by heat. This production of a volatile organic compound of copper is perhaps comparable with the formation of nickel and ferro-carbonyl.

The action of concentrated sulphuric acid on the pigment is attended with curious results. It dissolves with a fine crimson colour, and yields a new compound, the spectrum of which presents a very close resemblance to that of hæmatoporphyrin, the product obtained by the same treatment from hæmatin.

Professor Church estimates that the percentage composition of turacin is carbon 53.69, hydrogen 4.6, copper 7.01, nitrogen 6.96, and oxygen 27.74.

The Fountain Air Brush.—Mr. C. L. Burdick's Fountain Air Brush is an ingenious attempt to replace the artist's brush or pencil by a more subtle medium for conveying the colour to the canvas. It consists of a pencil something like a fountain pen. The colour to be used is held in a receptacle near the point and is sprayed on to the canvas or other material by the pressure of air which supplied from an air pump worked with the foot is communicated to or fro by a flexible indiarubber tubing. The spray of colour is regulated by a button on the pencil worked by the finger. Pressing this button downwards starts the spray, while moving it backwards or forwards increases respectively the quantity of colour distributed. When the pencil is held near the surface a fine line is produced, when removed further from the surface it becomes broader, and as the distance is increased it becomes a lighter and broader shadow. The advantages which the inventor claims for his device are as follows: by its use a uniform spray of colour is possible, devoid of irregularities or blotches, as the jet of air causes spray in a more or less fine state of division. As air is much softer and a more flexible medium than hair, the particles of colour are not stirred up or disarranged after they are deposited. It is maintained that the current of air and quantity of colour can be so manipulated as to produce varying lines and shadows which cannot be produced by any half dozen tools at the artist's command. Another point urged in favour of the air brush is that one wash or layer of colour may be put over another without disturbing the first.

By its use great delicacy of tints is accomplished. A shadow may be made with a black colour upon a white surface so delicate as to be invisible to the eye, and it is only after going over the surface three or four times that it becomes visible. By the use of the air brush the part of the picture which is immediately operated upon is not covered with the tool as when the pencil or brush is used. The operator can see his shadows growing. Another advantage urged by Mr. Burdick is the rapidity of action. "Not of the least importance is the fact, generally acknowledged, of a great saving of time by this tool. It means that the artist may place his conception upon paper or canvas before it is dulled or lost in the toil of slower methods."

It is, however, doubtful whether the fountain air brush will find much favour with artists, to whom haste should not be an object. They will probably criticise its action as too mechanical to correspond

with artistic conception. It would seem, too, that its use would entail too much bodily labour in the way of foot pumping, which would not tend to produce the necessary mental concentration upon the work in hand. If, however, it fails to interest the artist, it may become popular with the picture maker.

The Soirée of the Royal Society.—The annual Soirée of the Royal Society in May drew together the usual choice and selected exhibits of what is newest in scientific achievement, both in pure science and its application. Amongst the exhibits which represented the former was an apparatus to illustrate Mr. Henry Wilde's somewhat fanciful theory, that the exterior of the earth is permanently magnetic, and that there is an interior globe inside the exterior one that is movable and magnetic, rotating in the plane of the ecliptic $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees, and losing one revolution in 960 years, or 22.5 of a degree annually. It is imagined also that the internal sphere is electro-dynamic. In the model exhibited there were two globes, one within the other, each containing a coil of insulated wire, through which currents of electricity are sent, and mounted so that their motions are such as to agree with this theory. If a compass is placed over various parts of the globe, it is found that the same variations and dips are produced as is the case with the earth.

An exhibit representing work in pure research, but promising great future utility, was that relating to Professor Marshall Ward's experiments in Bacteriology, consisting of apparatus used to observe and measure the growths of bacteria, fungi, and other micro-organisms under the microscope. There was the culture cell, which has a floor of quartz and holds large quantities of water, so that while the light rays are easily admitted, the temperature of the cell cannot easily vary. There were also on view the screens of coloured glass and the various liquids concerned in the professor's experiments in growing microbes under various kinds of light, which seem to have proved that it is the blue rays which have such a distinctive effect on germ life, and suggest the idea that concentrated rays of blue light may in the future be found to be a powerful disinfectant.

Several experiments were shown in persistence of vision by the aerial-graphoscope which, besides showing the general effect of persistence in a striking manner, has been found to be capable of showing certain phenomena of persistence of vision, which are not shown by the older instruments devised to illustrate the retentive power of the retina of the eye. The general effect of persistence of vision as shown by this instrument was noticed in this REVIEW in 1889. One of the special features shown at the soirée was the demonstration of

the difference in intensity of the real and incidental image, and the gradual fading of incidental images. The white lathe of the instrument is generally tinted grey in the centre, diminishing in shade towards the extremities, where the lathe is left white. This has been done to give the lantern picture, which on the lathe being revolved is apparently cast in mid-air, as far as possible the same intensity of illumination in all parts. The centre of the lathe in revolving is always before the eye; here there is no incidental image. When there is no picture cast upon the revolving lathe, and only the white disc shown, though the centre is tinted grey, there appears a brilliant white spot in the centre of the disc, contrasting with the other portions, showing that the real image is of much greater intensity than the incidental image. It is also noticeable that the intensity of the illuminated disc gradually diminishes as the edge is reached, showing that the incidental image gradually fades from the retina, the lathe toward the extremities having to pass through more and more space, and the persistent image being less and less often reinforced. If the grey spot in the centre of the lathe is covered up with a piece of white paper, and a lantern picture is thrown upon the lathe, it is found that the difference of illumination between the real and incidental image is strikingly enhanced. The incidental disc can be used for almost any kind of optical projection with the same result as if a substantial screen were used, except that the effect of the object standing out boldly in space enhances the effect. When, however, objects in rapid motion are cast upon the incidental disc, the same result is not obtained as if a real disc was used, but peculiar forms and combinations are visible. Owing to (1) the relative motions of the lathe and the object, (2) owing to the centre of the disc being a real disc and not an incidental one, (3) owing to the varying intensity of the incidental disc in different portions of it. One of the most striking experiments was the projection of a simple slit, such as is used for spectrum work, on the incidental disc. The projection of the slit, instead of becoming a confusion of images, as would have been the case if it had been projected on an ordinary screen, was split up into a variety of forms, having the appearance of hieroglyphic writing. When the shadow of an iron ring rapidly revolved on the end of a cord is cast upon the disc, several shadows of the ring can be seen at the same time, and what is very curious if the eye is turned from the shadows of the ring to the ring itself the latter is seen to partake in the multiplication as the light is reflected back on it by the revolving lathe. A pretty experiment was the shadow of a falling ball, which was seen in several parts of the disc. Another remarkable effect is the projection of Newton's colour disc upon the

incidental screen. On the former being revolved in the optical lantern, the three primary colours, which owing to their confusion on the retina should have produced white light if projected on an ordinary disc, in this case only gave the individual colours. When, however, the experiment was arranged so that part of the colour disc was projected on the centre of the lathe, and part on the remainder of the other portions, the part which is the centre produced white light on being revolved, while the rest showed individual colours.

Amongst the exhibits that related to the applications of science, perhaps one of the more important was the artificial cable of the same capacity and conductor resistance as the Atlantic cable, which is to be laid next July by the Telegraph Construction and Maintenance Company. The capacity is 800 micro-farads, and 3350 B.A. units. This cable will have a speed of fifty words a minute, as compared with twenty-five or thirty words as now accomplished. Another interesting electrical exhibit was by Mr. James Wimshurst, who showed a practical device for telegraphic communication between lightships and the shore. If an electric cable is laid at the bottom of the sea, and the end taken to a lightship, it is twisted about the mooring cable as the ship swings with each tide and soon snaps. Mr. Wimshurst cuts the cable in half at the shackle between the cable and the mooring grapnel, and depends upon induction to bridge the interval.

Mr. Moissan's electric furnace was on view, as well as specimens of chemical elements obtained by means of it, such as vanadium, chromium, tungston, uranium. The furnace is a parallelopiped of limestone, having a cavity of similar shape cut in it. In the cavity is a small crucible made of a mixture of carbon and magnesia. The electrodes are made of hard carbon, and meet inside the cavity. Mr. Moissan has, by means of this furnace, accomplished the reduction of the most refractory metals, and has fused and volatilised lime and magnesia. Most of the metallic elements have been vaporised. An interesting experiment is the fusing of iron with an excess of carbon, and then quickly cooling the vessel containing the solution of carbon and molten iron by plunging it into cold water, or into a bath of molten lead. The result was the production of small colourless crystals of carbon, having the same properties as Nature's diamonds.

Mr. H. A. Fleuss showed his mechanical air-pump, which competes with the mercury pump in producing high vacua. By means of two such pumps worked in series, air pressure can be reduced to one-thousandth of a millimetre. This invention will commend itself to the makers of incandescent lamps, and it is a matter for surprise that the improvement of the mechanical pump has been so long neglected.

Nova et Vetera.

“BIDDING THE BEDES.”

IN almost all our Catholic Churches in England it is usual, at the Sunday Masses, in the interval before the Credo, to read out the names of those who are sick, of those who are lately dead, and those whose anniversaries occur during the week, and to commend them to the prayers of the congregation. In many churches, priest and people join in saying a *Pater Noster* and *Ave Maria*, or in some places the *De Profundis* or the versicle *Eternal Rest*, &c., is added. This reading of the “notices”, has, we love to think, its liturgical prototype in the diptychs and liturgical forms of both Eastern and Western antiquity. The Irish Church, in some parts at least of its area, has preserved some very graphic traces of the same traditional practice. As an illustration, we may instance what usually takes place at the conclusion of the parochial Mass in certain dioceses of the North of Ireland. When the priest has finished the last gospel, standing on the predella, his face turned to the altar, he asks the prayers of the people for a number of intentions. He names aloud these intentions, one by one, pausing between each to allow the people to say the *Pater Noster* and *Ave Maria* silently—silently, save for that impressive murmur of devotional fervour that swells from the many faithful lips which respond to his bidding. These intentions vary with the locality, but usually amongst them are to be found the following:—

“For our holy Father the Pope, that God may bless him and long preserve him to rule His Holy Church.”

“For the bishop and clergy of this diocese, especially those who have served in this charge.”

“For the sick and infirm of the parish.”

“For the congregation here present.”

“For the souls in Purgatory, especially for all those whose bodies lie buried in this graveyard.”

“For the souls of parents, kindred folks, and benefactors, especially for those for whom in duty or charity we are most bound to pray.”

Not unfrequently the priest, to whose heart is present one or other of those anxious cases which arise amid the countless cares of pastoral solicitude, adds: “For a particular intention.” Finally he says aloud

(in Latin) the *De Profundis* with the collect *Fidelium Deus*, and so dismisses the congregation.

It may be of interest to compare this and our own actual practice with what took place in the parish churches of England before the Reformation. Then, also, it was the custom for the priest to ask the prayers of the people during the parochial Mass for a given set of intentions. *Biddan* is the old English word for "to ask," and *Bed* or *Bede* is the old English for "prayer." Thus the public asking for the prayers was commonly called the "Bidding of the Bedes." Forms used for this purpose may be seen in Rock's "Church of Our Fathers" (vol. ii. 365), in H. O. Coxe's "Forms of Bidding Prayer," in "Exeter Cathedral," published by the Society of Antiquaries, and especially in the Lay Folks' Mass Book, edited by Canon Simmons.* With these sources most of our readers will be already familiar. We wish to add to the above by putting before them an ancient form written probably some time in the fifteenth century, and still preserved in the Record Office.† (State Papers, Henry VIII., vol. v. 1250.)

It may be noted that the Bidding prayer, though varying slightly in number, order, or wording of the petitions, usually divided itself into three main parts. These were:—

- (1) Prayers for the Spirituality (beginning with the Church and the Pope);
- (2) Prayers for the Temporality (beginning with the Realm and the King);
- (3) Prayers for the Dead (beginning with all souls and souls of parents).

These in the documents subjoined we shall call respectively A, B, and C. (Neither these letters and the numbers affixed to the petitions are in the document, but are added here for purposes of reference.) As to the time of "bidding the bedes," the following conclusions appear to be commonly accepted. In parochial churches it took place before the sermon or before the offertory. The priest stood at the entry to the chancel, but was directed to turn to the cross or rood when saying the prayers for the dead. In cathedral or collegiate churches it took place during the procession which preceded the Mass, and the procession halted for the purpose, or "made a station" under the rood-loft, so that the people in praying had before their eyes the figures of Our Crucified Saviour, Our Blessed Lady, and the faithful Disciple.

* From the forms given in the Lay Folks' Mass Book have been made the comparisons with York forms given in the notes to this paper.

† It was drawn up for the use of priests "bidding the bedes," and may be taken to represent the usual practice in England in the period which preceded the Reformation.

We give the document in italics, so that it may stand clear from our commentary.

It is endorsed

THE BEDES DECLARED BY PRESTS IN CHURCH.

It opens with what we should call the notices, and gives an alternative formula to be used according as the coming week included or did not include a first-class holiday.

Frendis, ye shall have upon N . . . [the feast of the] holy Apostle N, which day ye shall kepe as an high and a solemne fest oweth to be kept . . . [all persons of en] uff age shall fast upon it for the even. Or thus. Noo holidaes nor fasting dayes ye have not this week, but that ye may doo all manner of works that be pleasynge to God and helth unto yor soules.*

A. Next we have the "bedes" beginning with the general prayer for the Church at large, from which it proceeds to the petitions for the various orders of the spirituality.

1. *Ye shall knele down upon yor knees and make yor speciall pryers to Almyghte God and our lady Saynt Mary,† and all the holy companye of heyyen for the good stad and pees of all holy church, that God mayntene, save and kepe it.*

2. *Fyrst for oure holy fader the Pope of Rome,‡ with all his trew college of Cardynalls,§ Archbushshops, and busshops, abbats, priors, monks, chanons, persons, vicars, parish priests, in especially for the Archebushop of Canturbury, metropolitane and primate of England, so and also for my lorde of N. our diocesane.*

Next we have a relic of crusading time, in the petition for the

* "Der Frendes" is a formula used in York.

The formula given by Dr. Rock ("Church of our Fathers," vol. ii. 365), which was abridged and copied by Thomas Becon from the *Liber Festivalis*, opens as follows:—

"Masters and frendes: as for holy dayes and fasting dayes ye shall have none thys weke, but that ye may doe all manner of good workes, that shall bee to the honoure of God, and the profyt of your own soules. And therefore after a laudable consuetude, and lawfull custome of our mother holy Church, ye shal knele down moving your heartes unto Almightye God, and making your speciall prayers for the iii estates concerning all Crysten people—that is to say, for the Spiritualitye, the Temporaltye, and the Soules being in the paynes of Purgatorye. Fyrst, for our holy father the Pope with all his Cardinalls, &c. &c."

† "And to the glorious Virgyn his moder, Our Lady, Saynt Mary."—In York form, printed by W. de Norde in 1509 ("Lay Folks' Mass Book," p. 75). "Our lady Saynt Mary, and to all the feir falychip that is in heaven," is in an earlier York form.

‡ The most ancient of all the forms of English bidding prayers dating from Anglo-Saxon times has

"Wutan we gebiddan for urne
Papan on Rome, for urne
cyning, forne Arcebisceop."

Thus "the Pope, the King, and the Archbishop," was the order in which the Anglo-Saxon Church prayed for the powers that be.

§ Here the York formula inserts, "For the patriark of ierusalem and especially for the holy Cross that God was done upon."

Holy Land, thus placed in the midst of the prayer for the spirituality as a church interest of the first magnitude, and one which in those times lay very near to all Christian hearts.

3. *Ye shall praye also for the Holy land and the . . . [temp] le that God may send it into* crysten mennes hands the more to be honored for our pryers.*

4. *Ye shall pryve also for all men and women . . . in what order, estate, or degre soever the stande in, from the highest estate unto the lawest degre.*

Then the petitions return to the clergy, first parochial and then monastic. (The allusion to the Abbot of Westminster points to the formula being used in some church appropriated by the abbey and served by one of its vicars.)

5. *Ye shall pryve also for all them that have care and charge of mans soules as persons, vicars, and parish prests,† and in especially for the Abbot of Westmynstyr with all the cocont [and for Master Vicar of N. which hath]*

The writer of the formula had written the words we put in brackets, but apparently thought better of it, for he has erased them and substituted

and for the Vicar of this Chyrche which hath charge of yo^r soules, and for all prests and clerks that serve in this chyrch or hath served therein wher throgh Goddes servis hath ben or is the better upholden or mayntened.

6. *Ye shall pryve also for all them that hath taken any holy ord^r of profecion upon them that God give them grace to observe and kepe it to the plesur of God and helth of theyr soules.‡*

The bedes having covered in these six petitions the whole field of the spirituality, enter into the second section—the domain of the temporality.

B.—1. *On the second partie, ye shall praye for the unyite and pees of all Christn realmes, and especially for the good state, pees and tranquillite of this noble realm of England—that is to say, for our sovereyn lorde, the Kyng, the Queyn, with all oder noble lords§ and stats of this realme,*

* "Out of hethen mennes hands."—York form.

† Here, after the prayer for the clergy, an ancient York form adds the following beautiful petition, in the robust north country speech, for the happy co-operation of priest and people:

"That God give thame grace so well for to teche thare suggettis, ilke curat in his degre, and the suggestes so well to wyrke etter heyifull teching that both the techers and the suggestes may com [to] the blys that aye sall last."

‡ "And for all manner of men and women of relygion, that God give thame grace, perseverance in onest and clene relygion kepinge."—Early York form.

§ The early York form puts in the Commons: "And for the peris and lordes, and the gode comuners of the lande." The Diocese of York, from its nearness to the Border, had close and constant acquaintance with its troublesome Scotch neighbours. So in praying for the "profeitt and weillfare of the rem" (realm), it vigorously adds, "and schame and senchyp (sinking) to ouer enemyse, gaynstanding and restrenyng thare power and thare males (malice)."

that God may give them grace soo to counsell, rule, and governe that God be pleased, worship to them, and profette unto the realme.

The next petition marks the solicitude of the Church for her unborn children and future members.

2. *Ye shall praye also for all women that ben in our ladyes bondes that God may send the child ryght shape and christendom and the moder purificacion of the holy Church.*

By "Tilmen tythers" is meant farmers paying tithe.

3. *Ye shall praye also for all trew tilmen tythers* that God encrease and multiplie ther goods.*

4. *Ye shall praye also for all manner of fruits that be set, sown, or doon upon the erth that God may send such seasonable weder that they may grow, encrease, and multiplie to the sustentacion and helpe of all cristen pepull.*

5. *Ye shall praye also for all them that be seke or dyseased in this parishe or any parishe that God may send to them helth and the rather for our prayers.†*

6. *Ye shall praye also for all trew pilgrymes and palmers that hath taken ther way to Rome, Jerusalem, Saynt James, or any oder holy place that God send hus part of ther gats ["gates"—i.e., journeyings]‡ and them part of our prayers.*

[Here, in the York form, prayer was offered for all who were "in dette or in dedely sinne," that "God in his mercy bring tham some oute thereof," and for the perseverance of all who were in grace. Here, also, this part of the Bedes was broken by a Pater Noster, Ave and Gloria, suffrages and three collects.]

The next bede was for the benefactors of the Church, and we commend to the notice of the clergy the fact that the encouragement of prayers is held out not only to actual givers but to those who persuade others to give.

7. *Ye shall praye also for all them that find any lyght in this church or gyffyth any bequest as book, bell, chales, vestment, autyr cloth . . . any oder adornement where throgh Goddes servis hath ben or is the better upholden and mayntened; and for all them that gereth any good counsell thereto that God may rewarde them in ther most nede.*

The offering of the holy bread or "pain bénit" was the custom here in England before the Reformation, as it still is in France. It was given by the parishioners in turn.

* The York form uses for tithes the Northern word "tendes," and prays for them that loyally pay them—"to God and Holy Church"—and also for them that do not, "that God of his mercy brynge theym sone to amedemente."

† The York form is wisely alternative: "And turne them to the way that is most to Goddes plesure and welfare of theyre soules."

‡ "That God of his goodnes graunte them parte of oure good prayers, and us parte of theyr good pylgrimages"—"for all pilgrims and palmers and for all that any good gates has gone or shall go" are found in York forms.

8. Ye shall praye also for them that this day gyveth bred to be hallowed, for him that fyrst beganne and them that longest holdyth on.*

[Here the York form introduced prayer to Our Lady : " For thame and for us and for all other that need has of prayer in wirchyp of our lady Saynt Mary ilk man and woman hayls oure lady with V. aves." This was followed by the anthem *Ave Regina Cælorum* (or *Regina Cæli* in passhal time) and the collect. Another form has : " In worship of our lady Saynt Marye and her Vjoyes."]

The Bedes next enter into the third division—the prayers for the dead. We may note the prominence given to spiritual kinship.

C.—1. On the third partie, ye shall praye as ye be bounde for yor faders soules, for yor moders soules, for yor godfaders soules, yor godmoders soules, yor godbrothers soules, yor godsisters soules, yor grandfaders soules, yor grandmoders soules, with all yor godfrendes soules, and for all those soules that be in the bitter paynes of purgatory their abydyng the mercy of Almyghty God. 2. In especially for those soules that have most nede and lest helpe : † with all the soules whose bones rest in this Church or Church yarde, or any oder holy place.

Every man and womon of yor charyte say PATER NOSTER and an AVE DE PROFUNDIS CLAMAVI. ‡

So ends the document.

The custom of " bidding the bedes " in our ancient parish churches was undoubtedly a constant and powerful means of keeping before the minds of the Catholic people the sublime doctrine of the Communion of Saints, and at the same time the duties of Christian charity towards the Church and State, towards their neighbour, and to the Faithful departed. The very recital of the petitions—too long, alas ! for the unmortified impatience of our nineteenth century—was a continuous preaching of these doctrines and duties, and surely none the less practical because combined with public prayer.

Let us prize and venerate the more what remains to us of the olden time, and who knows if, later on, some of our zealous clergy may not feel inspired to attempt, *pro loci et temporis circumstantiis*, a prudent and partial revival of the practice !

J. MOYES.

* For those that first started the custom, and those who will longest continue to maintain it. The same expression was used in the North.

" We salle also pray for thame that this day gafe brede to this holy kirk, brede to be made of ; for thame it first began and longest holdes opon."—Early York form.

† " And specially for all yos sallys that has most nyde to be prayed for and fewest frendes has."—York form.

‡ " And that oure prayers myght sumwhat stand thame in stede ilk man and woman helpe hertly with a *Pater Noster* and *Ave*," " and now ilk man and woman say iii *Pater Noster* and ii *Ave Maria*, and have Goddes blyssyng and our ladys and all holy kyirks."—York forms.

NOTE ON THE TRANSLATION "FULL OF GRACE"
IN LUKE I. 28.

ONE of the results of Mr. Rendel Harris' most acute and suggestive "Study of Codex Bezaë" is to call attention to translations of phrases and words in Scripture, and to test their antiquity by the rules he has laid down. The Vulgate rendering of *κεχαριτομένη* by "gratia plena" is so interesting in itself and in relation to textual criticism, that I venture to point out how Mr. Harris' rules affect it; though circumstances hinder me from completing the evidence as I should wish, I may induce some one better qualified to take the subject up. Mr. Harris, having numerous instances before him where D (Beza's Codex) departs from the received Greek text, but agrees with the Syriac and Egyptian versions, argues that in such cases the old Latin is the original, and that the Oriental scribes had it before them when making their translations. This would carry back the age of the Latin version beyond the time of Origen; and if we add the frequent concurrence in these variants of the relics of Tatian's Harmony, we are obliged to go back, at least for the Gospels, as far as the middle of the second century.

When we come to apply these canons to the passage in question, the first thing to note is that D reads: "Et introiens angelus ad eam dixit habet benedicta." It would be interesting to know the origin of this variant, which on Mr. Harris' principle we should not expect; perhaps he may add to a future edition of his book some account of the divergences of D from the other old Latin texts. Nor can we appeal to the translations of Hermas or St. Irenæus, nor to Tertullian, as they do not appear to quote the passage. This is the more to be regretted in the case of St. Irenæus, because he has an interesting variant in a neighbouring verse—"Ecce ancilla tua domine"—apparently due to independent translation (reading σου instead of του), where D goes with the ordinary reading.

But the term "full of grace" is found in the Peshitto, and must have been read by St. Ephrem in the MS. before him; it is also—as Fr. Livius quotes Fr. Morris—found in the Coptic, though he does not say in what version. Later evidences of it in the East are to be found in the apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy, and in the passing of Mary. Finally, Tatian in Ciasca's version reads (i. 28): "Ave gratia plena, dominus noster tecum." We may therefore conclude, if Mr. Harris' principles hold good, that the Vulgate rendering is at any rate as old as the middle of the second century, and belongs to the earliest translation of the New Testament.

It may be remarked that D also departs from the Syriac and Egyptian versions in the latter part of the same verse, by inserting the gloss "benedicta tu in mulieribus," which they omit. No doubt the original translators were led to choose a periphrase by the difficulty of giving the force of the perfect participle in Latin and Syriac, and by the rarity of the Greek verb, which Origen remarks on. St. Justin has a like expression in his well-known parallel between the Blessed Virgin and Eve (Dial. 100).

The equivalent selected by the translators lay to their hands in Acts vi. 8, where the inspired writer speaks of St. Stephen as *πλήρης χάριτος καὶ δυνάμεως*; concerning which we may note that the metaphorical use of *πλήρης* is in the New Testament confined to St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts, and is especially common in the sixth chapter of the latter.

J. R. GASQUET.

Notes of Travel and Exploration.

Italian Africa.—Mr. Theodore Bent's* archæological journey to explore the ruins of Aksum, the ancient Sabæan capital of Ethiopia, led him through the Italian possessions on the Red Sea and adjacent mainland. He landed on January 2, 1893 at Massowah, which, despite its great heat, he describes as otherwise healthy, free from fever and malaria, and exempt from insect plagues. The officers of the garrison declare it to be less unhealthy than many of their home stations, as a few weeks' sojourn on the high plateau restores the vigour lost in its torrid atmosphere. A light railway has been constructed for a distance of twenty-seven kilometres across the littoral plain, the traversing of which was the most trying part of the journey into the interior. From its terminus at Sahati, the ascent of the plateau begins on mule back, at first by a series of terraced plains each higher than the other, and afterwards by a steep and winding, but good road, which the Italians have by this time constructed as far as Asmara, on the high plateau between seven and eight thousand feet above the sea. The earlier part of the ascent is through rich vegetation with orchid-draped forests, and gladioli and other flowers in blossom, but these are exchanged higher up for the strange quolquol forests characteristic of the country, composed of the *Euphorbia candelabrum*, so-called from its rigid ramification suggestive of a many-branched candlestick. The climate and general aspect of the country at the high levels reminded the author of Mashonaland, greater elevation here compensating for closer vicinity to the equator. The Ethiopian plateau, when the *ciglione* or "eyebrow" of the land is attained, forms a vast, almost unbroken plain, save where it is cut deeply into by the river beds, or where the Semyan and other mountain ranges rise some 15,000 ft. high. Asmara, the Italian outpost towards the interior, is a strong and well-fortified position, surrounded by detached villages in which the native troops, both Mussulman and Abyssinian, are quartered. An experiment in agriculture has been tried here by an Italian colony, successfully, as far as cereals are concerned, but with disappointing results as regards vines and olives. The latter, though indigenous

* "The Sacred City of the Ethiopians." By J. Theodore Bent. London: Longmans. 1893

and growing freely in a wild state, do not flourish under cultivation, and the imported plants give little hope of furnishing a remunerative industry. The climate of the high ground in Abyssinia is bracing and invigorating, while that of the low river valleys is so much the reverse, that a single night passed in them means infallible inoculation with malarial fever of the worst type.

Natives of the Abyssinian Border.—The market of Asmara, attended by the native population from miles around, gave opportunities for the study of their habits and customs. Ornament is more regarded in dress than cleanliness, and the women, while lavishing embroidery on their tunics and drawers, and loading their necks and fingers with silver chains and rings, leave their hair fixed in its elaborate coiffure for an indefinite time, and when it is renewed on some great occasion, add the finishing touch by placing a pat of rancid butter on the summit and leaving it to melt in the sun. They ride, like the men, with bare feet, and in the ring stirrups admitting the great toe alone. Nominal Christianity is in Abyssinia found compatible with polygamy on the part of the chiefs, and with a universal laxity of domestic morals in all classes. The religious marriage is, indeed, binding, not only for life but in perpetuity, while the civil ceremony, celebrated with inordinate festivity, is a mere temporary contract dissoluble at will, and is the form of union generally prevailing, the intervention of the Church being sought only by elderly couples. They live thus in a state of practical ex-communication, being denied the sacraments until ecclesiastically married, and the result is to render their morals, as Cardinal Massaia repeatedly declares, rather more degraded than those of their Mussulman neighbours. Their worship is, according to the same authority, a mixture of Judaism and paganism, the Tabot or wooden image of the Ark of the Covenant forming the central object of adoration, and animal sacrifices being practised to such an extent as to render the precincts of the churches on some occasions perfect shambles. Their habitations are loathsome from their total absence of the most elementary ideas of cleanliness, and their cookery is rendered disgusting by the same cause. Their favourite grain is a sort of rye called *teff*, which is made into flat cakes like crumpets, of a chocolate brown colour. Their cattle are in some districts of the Indian species with humps and long dewlaps, and beef eaten raw with a fiery sauce of chillies and other condiments is their favourite delicacy. Fermented honey and water, forming a sort of hydromel

called *tedge*, is brewed in vast quantities on festive occasions, and drunk on such a scale as to produce stupefying intoxication.

Abyssinian Antiquities.—Mr. Bent's journey was successful in its main object of throwing light on the early history of Ethiopia by his exploration of the remains at Aksum, its sacred city, and other places in the province of Tigré. There seems little doubt that the ancient Aksumite Empire, flourishing down to the middle of the sixth century, had its first capital at Yeha, where some interesting remains were discovered by him, and was transferred to Aksum before or about the Christian era. It was founded by a Sabaeen colony from Southern Arabia, originally attracted by the rich products procured by trade with the interior, and it introduced the form of sun worship characteristic of Arabia, of whose influence Mr. Bent finds traces in the present Abyssinian Church. Among the remains described and photographed by him are an avenue of obelisks ranging from rude stone monoliths to highly-finished and decorated columns, and a series of early inscriptions commemorating successful wars and expeditions of pre-historic rulers.

Journey Through the Yemen.*—Mr. Harris, in 1892, when the rebellion against Turkish authority was still convulsing the Yemen, effected a successful journey through that little-known region. Constituting as it does, the south-west corner of Arabia, it is divided into three different zones. The first is the Tehama, or littoral plains fringing it to the south and west, forming a desert tract in which the rainfall is scanty, the climate sultry, and vegetation almost absent, except in the oases scattered over its surface. From these lowlands great ranges of mountains, parted by wide and fertile valleys, rise to a height of 14,000 to 15,000 ft. forming the Jibal or highlands. Here the abundant supply of water vivifies an exceptionally fertile soil, causing that luxuriance of production that won for this country the name of Arabia Felix. This is the home of the coffee shrub, grown on the lower slopes, whose steep sides are cultivated in terraces irrigated by the streams that dash down their sides. Not only is the mountain country much more temperate than the scorching plains, but it is, moreover, fertilised by two wet seasons in spring and autumn. The third region is the high plateau

* "A Journey Through the Yemen." By Walter B. Harris. Edinburgh: Blackwood. 1893.

of central Yemen, of which the mountains form the steep scarp. A vast and barren plain lying at an average altitude of some eight thousand feet above the sea, with black ridges of volcanic rock breaking its arid level, it is verdant only after the rainy season. The surrounding mountains, wherever they come in sight, are shattered into the most fantastic pinnacles and spires, on the summits of which are seen crag built villages and towers. In some places this table-land is riven into chasms by the rivers, which run thousands of feet below its level in narrow gorges with precipitous sides like the cañons of America. From their brink the coffee groves and villages are visible far below, while the distance is closed by peaks of the wildest and most extravagant outline. The camel of the highlands, a dark and rough-haired creature, traverses roads which would be impassable for ordinary mules. The crags are tenanted by innumerable monkeys, and the plateau is the home of a wonderfully resplendent lizard, sheathed in armour of gorgeous metallic blue.

History and Ethnology of the Yemen.—The Yemenite nation consists of two main branches, the Ishmaelites, who claim descent from the son of Hagar through Adnan, a contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar, and the descendants of Kahtan, identified with the Joktan of Scripture, of the line of Shem, another of whose posterity, Hazarmaveth, gave his name to Hadramaut. Recent investigations show reason to believe, on the authority of early inscriptions, that Yemen was the seat of a very ancient civilisation, contemporary with that of Egypt, if indeed it were not, as some theorists conjecture, the mysterious land of Punt, whence the people of that country brought their peculiar form of culture. The existence of two great dynasties is at least held to be established, of which the first, the Minaean, numbered thirty-two kings whose names are recorded, and who seem to have ruled the country as far as the Isthmus of Suez. Subsequent to them, after a considerable interval, come the Sabaean kings, who can be traced back to the time of Solomon, a thousand years before Christ. To their dynasty it is believed the Queen of Sheba belonged, as that country is identified with Saba, the capital of the Sabaean Empire, a city lying some days' journey to the north-east of Sanaa, the present capital of Yemen. A vast dam or barrage, probably for irrigation purposes, still exists, though in ruins, to attest the pre-historic grandeur of these rulers, as it is supposed to have been built some 1,700 years B.C., and its bursting about 120 A.D. was a catastrophe which carried devastation through the fertile valley below it.

Annexation of Pondoland.—The country now about to be brought under civilised rule in South Africa, by an arrangement with its paramount chiefs, is about the size of Wales, which it is said by a correspondent in the *Times* of March 24 to be not unlike in some of its features. Having hitherto been a sort of buffer state between the Cape Colony and Natal, it remained under unchecked native rule, and was the scene of the most horrible atrocities. Its inhabitants, numbering about 150,000, are an indolent people, inferior in morality to either Kafirs or Zulus, and distinct from both. The arbitrary will of the chiefs has been the only law, and every species of property either in land or food was held in common. It is a country of considerable capabilities, and a valuable addition to the English South African Empire. Its surface is diversified with hills and valleys, the former rising in places to a height of 3,000 ft., and vegetation is everywhere luxuriant, firs and palms, bananas, oranges, lemons, cotton, and tea flourishing side by side. It is in the abundance of its water supply that it more especially surpasses the adjoining countries, for it is not only traversed throughout its length by the St. John river—compared for the lower twenty miles of its course in depth and width to the Thames at Hammersmith—but a number of tributary streams form a network of water channels over its entire surface. It contains in addition, at the mouth of its principal river, the best harbour between Table Bay and the Portuguese territory, with its entrance marked and guarded by two great rocks, 2,000 ft. high, forming the Gates of St. John, through which the river passes to the sea. These natural beacons, forming a striking feature on a low-lying coast, add to the value of the anchorage inside, which is capacious enough to accommodate half the British Navy. A little dredging will enable the bar across the entrance, already deeper than those of the other harbours on the coast, to be crossed by the largest ships, thus rendering it, at a comparatively small outlay, one of the principal outlets of that part of Africa.

Franco-German Delimitation Treaty in West Africa.—The agreement arrived at between France and Germany last March, as to their respective spheres of influence in West Africa, settles some of the outstanding questions with regard to that portion of the continent. The net result is to give the latter Power an irregular wedge of territory, narrowing from a coast line extending for 120 miles along the Bight of Biafra, to a small strip of the southern shore of Lake Tchad, where the mouth of the Shari is fixed as the eastern limit of her aspirations. The difficulty about according to

France a means of access to the Niger system was solved by a compromise, the boundary line being deflected here so as to give her a station on the Mayo Kebbi, a tributary of the Benue, while a similar concession to Germany in the basin of the Congo, places her in contact with the Sangha river, an affluent of that great stream. The Anglo-German agreement of November, 1893, together with the Anglo-French arrangement of August, 1890, admits the whole of Bornu as within the sphere of British influence, which thus includes the greater portion of the western and some of the southern shore of Lake Tchad. East and south of that sheet of water are Baghirmi and Wadai, two powerful States, whose destinies are still unsettled, though the retirement of Germany from this portion of the field leaves France and England the sole claimants of the right to control it. Still further east, the three ex-Egyptian provinces of Darfur, Kordofan, and the Bahr-el-Ghazal, secured to England by treaties with Germany and Italy, have not yet been recognised by France as within her sphere, and may therefore be the subject of dispute later on. The same may be said of the French claims to territories in Muri and Adamawa, founded on treaties with native chiefs negotiated by Lieutenant Mizon, in contravention of the prior rights of the Royal Niger Company. The latter association, which first opened up these countries, seems, on the evidence as yet before the world, to have been hardly treated, as it is cut off from expansion eastward by concessions to Germany, while the dispute arising out of Lieutenant Mizon's filibustering raid on its territories is as yet unsettled.

British Central Africa.—Under this collective heading are now known those vast territories north of the Zambesi, lying between the German and Portuguese dominion on the north and south and the Congo State on the west. According to statistics given from authoritative sources in the *Times* of January 22, the area of the entire is no less than 500,000 square miles—larger than the German and Austrian Empires together—and is divided into the “sphere of influence,” extending from Uganda to the coast, hitherto administered by the British East Africa Company, and the “British Central African Protectorate,” comprising Nyassaland, ruled by an Imperial Commissioner, who is also, by special arrangement, the representative of the British South Africa Company. The latter body contributes to the expenses of administration a quota, amounting in 1892 to £10,000, and in 1893 to £27,500, to which a further £5000 a year will be added as soon as the Barotse country on the Upper Zambesi is taken up. In the latter region is found the bulk of the native

population, roughly estimated for the entire of British Central Africa as 4,000,000, while the European settlers number but 237, of whom 210 are British subjects. The Shiré Province, the seat of administration, with Blantyre, containing 4,000 inhabitants, as its capital, is administered on the lines of a Crown Colony, and divided into eight districts with at least two officials stationed in each. Nine post-offices and seven custom-houses mark the development of this region, where roads are being made in all directions, and thousands of acres are planted with coffee shrubs, now in full bearing and yielding a berry which commands a high price in the London market. Ivory is the staple of the trade on Lake Nyassa, as elephants still abound in British Central Africa, which furnishes about a fourth of the total export of the continent, though much of it passes through Portuguese territory to the coast. The trade of the Protectorate amounted in 1892 to £80,000, including in nearly equal proportions exports and imports.

Travels in Hadramaut.—Those enterprising travellers, Mr. Theodore Bent and his wife, have followed up their Abyssinian explorations with a trip to the little-known region of Hadramaut in Southern Arabia. While the name is generally applied to great part of the coast of that country, the Hadramaut Valley proper is a depression running from west to east about 150 miles inland. Although reached by the German naturalist, Herr Leo Hirsch, in the course of the previous year, it has been almost unvisited by travellers, and the importance of adding to the scanty stock of knowledge concerning it induced the Indian Government to send a competent surveyor, Imam Sherif, with the expedition. The authorities at Aden, nevertheless, threw many difficulties in the way of its starting, and the interpreter they supplied to it proved rather an incumbrance than an assistance. From Aden the journey was made by sea to Makulla, the Sultan of which is in British pay, and thence Shibam, the capital of Hadramaut, was reached in January of this year. Here they found an unexpected ally in the Sultan—favourably predisposed towards Englishmen by long residence in India—and with his assistance the valley was very thoroughly and satisfactorily explored. The most interesting result was the discovery of the ruins of an ancient city beyond its northern boundary on the edge of the great central desert of Arabia. Exploration of these remains may throw some light on the interesting problem of the early civilisation of Southern Arabia and its connection with that of Egypt. Mr. Bent's journey may thus prove supplementary to that of Mr. Harris through the Yemen noticed on a foregoing page.

The geography of Southern Arabia has been much elucidated by the expedition, as Imam Sherif has made a complete map of the country traversed. Its present barrenness, as contrasted with its former production of gums and spices, is due to the total destruction of the forests, and consequent desiccation of the soil. The valleys are now choked with sand blown down from the northern deserts, and cultivation is only possible where water can be obtained by boring through its superincumbent layers. Mr. Bent believes that these valleys were at one time arms of the sea stretching inland towards the central plateau, and that the level of the entire coast has been raised by the process which has made them dry land. The inhabitants, along the route chosen for the return journey, were extremely fanatical, and the villagers in some places fired on the party.

American Polar Expedition.—The resuscitation of interest in Arctic discovery is evidenced by the number of attempts now projected for the attainment of very high latitudes, if not of the Pole itself. One of these has been planned by an enterprising Washington journalist, Mr. Walter Wellman, who left New York on March 14, *en route* to Norway, whence he is to sail for Spitzbergen, the basis of his expedition. His three American companions, Professor Owen B. French, of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Dr. Thomas B. Mohun, a Washington physician, and Mr. Charles C. Dodge, a capable artist and photographer, have been chosen out of a number of volunteers. In Norway the party will be reinforced by ten additional members, already experienced in similar travelling. Starting from Tromsø early in May, they were to direct their course to Dane's Island on the north-west coast of Spitzbergen, where a house already exists, and where a *depôt* will be established with a sufficient supply of provisions to last a year. Here two men will be left in charge, while the remainder of the party start for the far north in aluminium boats constructed in Baltimore, and only weighing 400 lbs. each. They are provided with runners, so as to be convertible into sledges should ice have to be crossed. Mr. Wellman expects to reach the edge of the pack ice in the middle of May, his ship being available for transport thus far, and calculates that the journey over it may be accomplished at the rate of twenty-five miles a day, enabling the adventurous party to reach the Pole in fifty days of continuous travelling. The end of June would thus find them at the zero of latitude, leaving the remainder of the summer for their return journey. (*The Times*, March 22.)

The English Expedition to Franz Josef Land.—Mr. Jackson intends to lay siege to the fortress of the far north in more leisurely fashion, establishing his basis of supplies in Franz Josef Land, for which he is to sail from the Thames about the end of July, in a ship specially constructed for ice-navigation. The party will consist of six men in addition to sailors and navigators, about eighteen persons all told. They hope to reach Franz Josef Land, *via* Archangel, towards the end of August, and there to construct a house and go into winter quarters, sending home the ship and crew, and retaining only the sledging party with some Samoyeds picked up on the Siberian coast. With sledges, dogs and ponies they will push north in the following spring, establishing a line of dépôts as they go, and passing the second winter in a more northerly position if drift wood be found in sufficient quantities to build a hut. During the second winter and summer Mr. Jackson hopes to reach very high latitude, returning to his original base for the third winter.

Notices of Books.

The Great Pestilence (A.D. 1348-9). By FRANCIS AIDAN GASQUET, D.D., O.S.B. 8vo, pp. 244. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co. 1893.

NOT a few readers, perhaps, may at first sight be led, by the title of this work, to take it up without a suspicion of its great historical importance; or, worse still, to pass it by altogether as being apparently too technical to be of interest to the general reader. We must therefore at once declare that this new work of the learned Benedictine, Dom Gasquet, is indeed a specimen of accurate historical research, but that it is much more also; and that, in spite of much that is strictly scientific in its mode of treatment, this work is far from being what is called "dry reading." Indeed, it is full of most interesting matter, presented in a thoroughly readable style, and it altogether constitutes an important contribution to the history of England in the fourteenth century.

The story of the Great Pestilence of 1348-9 is commonly alluded to in ordinary manuals, or even in larger works, in a brief and, as clearly appears, after reading Dr. Gasquet's book, in a very inadequate manner. There is so much that is politically important and brilliant in the history of the period that the fact of the Great Pestilence is treated usually as of secondary importance only. Even a writer like the late Mr. J. R. Green failed to appreciate the enormous social consequences of the Plague known as "the Black Death," and it is clear that much remained to be said on the subject, even after the works of such writers as Professor Seebohm, Dr. Jessop, Dr. Cunningham, and Professor Thorold Rogers.

In his "Epidemics of Britain," Dr. Creighton has dealt at great length with the subject of the Black Death, but, of course, he could only write from his professional point of view, and he has consequently left out much that is of primary interest to the historian. In Dr. Gasquet's work, we not only learn the facts of the case, but we are admitted to a view of their consequences, which invests the whole subject with peculiar interest, and deserves the most serious attention of the philosophical historian. As the author himself says:

The "Black Death" inflicted what can only be called a wound deep in

the social body, and produced nothing less than a revolution of feeling and practice. Unless this is understood, from the very circumstances of the case, we shall go astray in our interpretation of the later history of England. In truth, this great pestilence was a turning-point in the national life. It formed the real close of the mediæval period and the beginning of our modern age. It produced a break with the past, and was the dawn of a new era. The sudden sweeping away of the population, and the consequent scarcity of labourers, raised, it is well recognised, new and extravagant expectations in the minds of the lower classes; or, to use a modern expression, labour began then to understand its value and assert its power. . . . As regards education, the effect of the catastrophe on the body of the clergy was prejudicial beyond the power of calculation. To secure the most necessary public ministrations of the rites of religion, the most inadequately prepared subjects had to be accepted, and even these could be obtained only in insufficient numbers. The immediate effect on the people was a religious paralysis. Instead of turning men to God, the scourge turned them to despair, and this not only in England, but in all parts of Europe.

Thus Dr. Gasquet sums up some of the leading aspects of his subject. But before dealing with those far-reaching results of the Great Pestilence, we naturally wish to know what the disease was in itself. So far as history actually goes, the sickness can be traced only from the ports of the Black Sea, and possibly from those of the Mediterranean to which traders along the main roads of commerce with Asiatic countries brought their merchandise for conveyance to the Western world. But it is clear that the pestilence had already visited the more remote parts of the East, as far as India and China. Then, as now, trading vessels were the common means of transporting the contagion from place to place. Matteo Villani distinctly reports its conveyance to Europe by Italian traders, who had fled before it from the ports on the eastern shores of the Black Sea. Of the special symptoms which characterised the Plague of 1348-9, four are distinctly mentioned:

1. Gangrenous inflammation of the throat and lungs.
2. Violent pains in the region of the chest.
3. The vomiting and spitting of blood.
4. The pestilential odour coming from the bodies and breath of the sick.

To these symptoms must be added the common appearance at an early stage of swellings and carbuncles under the arms and in the groins. "From the carbuncles and glandular swellings," says a contemporary writer, "many recovered; from the blood-spitting, none." In fact, if we judge from the testimonies of the best medical authorities of the period, the disease seems to have manifested itself under two forms: one characterised by "constant fever and blood-spitting," the other by the appearance of "swellings and

carbuncles," generally less fatal in their effects upon the constitution.

We should not be probably justified in inferring from these different groups of symptoms, the presence of distinct morbid elements.

The difference in the symptoms may have been due merely to differences in the bodily habit of the persons attacked. There seems to be no room for doubt as to the contagious nature of the evil, and we are probably safe in attributing it to the agency of microbes of some kind. Considering how difficult is the task even now to circumscribe and limit the area of a given epidemic, in spite of our better medical knowledge and of the more rational views on public health now prevailing, we may well imagine how rapid and terrible the spread of the contagion must have been in those towns of the Middle Ages, where all the rules of sanitation, which we hold to be of primary importance, appear to have been altogether ignored. In the absence of all knowledge of the best means for the isolation of cases, or indeed of the requisite conditions for such an isolation, the situation appeared hopeless, as indeed it was. Many sought safety in flight, but, as we are told, succumbed nevertheless, because, no doubt, they carried away with them the germs of the disease either already in their bodies, or even more frequently in the clothes or articles of food they were taking away with them.

Whilst the Plague was at its height, King Philip VI. requested the medical faculty of Paris to report on the nature of the disease, and on the best methods of dealing with it. The doctors appear to have had practically no remedy to suggest, but they were quite clear as to the infectious nature of the disease, and strongly recommended separation from the sick, whenever possible. "It is chiefly the people of one house, and above all those of the same family," they report, "who are close together, who die, for they are always near to those who are sick." The same is constantly being said by our medical authorities at the present day, when cholera, small-pox, scarlet fever, or diphtheria come to visit us.

The Plague first reached England in the autumn of 1348, and most of the contemporary accounts seem to agree in naming the coast of Dorsetshire as the part first infected. Melcombe Regis, or Weymouth, appears to be entitled to the melancholy distinction of being the first English town where the Plague made its appearance. Starting from Melcombe Regis, the contagion spread rapidly over Dorset, Devon, and Somerset. At last it reached Gloucester, Oxford, and London. If we judge from contemporary documents at our disposal, the metropolis appears to have presented every favourable

condition for a pestilential outbreak. One slight glimpse of the state of the streets about this time is afforded, Father Gasquet tells us, in a document issued by the king to the mayor and sheriffs when in 1361 a second visitation threatened to become as destructive to human life as that of 1349 :

Because [says the royal letter] by the killing of great beasts, from whose putrid blood running down the streets, and the bowels cast into the Thames, the air in the city is very much corrupted and infected, whence abominable and most filthy stench proceeds, sickness and many other evils have happened to such as have abode in the said city or have resorted to it, and great dangers are feared to fall out for the time to come, unless remedy be presently made against it; we, willing to prevent such dangers, ordain, by consent of the present Parliament, that all bulls, oxen, hogs, and other gross creatures be killed at either Stratford or Knightsbridge.

The disorganisation of all public services, the impossibility to enforce the laws, the almost entire stoppage of trade and commerce throughout the country, must have caused all over the land the greatest confusion. But it is of special interest to see how grave was the perturbation in ecclesiastical affairs caused by the epidemic. For instance, on February 25th, 1349, the king was informed that death had carried off the entire community of the Augustinian Canons at Ivychurch, in the diocese of Salisbury, with one single exception.

At Romsey, the nuns in 1333 were ninety in number, as appears from the lists of those who recorded their vote for the election of an abbess. After the Plague their number is found reduced to eighteen, and they never rose above twenty-five until their final suppression. We also get some idea of the consequences of the epidemic, as regards the state of the clergy, from the lists of ordination to the priesthood. Thus, the Friars Minor had two houses, one at Winchester, the other at Southampton. For those in 1347 and 1348 three priests were ordained. From that time till the 21st of December, 1359, no more received orders :

The same extraordinary want of subjects [says Father Gasquet] appears in the case of the Carmelites. With them, between 1346 and 1348, eleven subjects received the priesthood. The next Carmelite ordained was in December 1357, and only three in all were made priests between the Great Plague and the close of the year 1366. The Dominicans had also only one priest ordained in ten years—that is, in the period from March 1349 to December 1359.

It is obvious [our author continues] that the sudden removal of so large a proportion of the clerical body must have caused a breach in the continuity of the best traditions of ecclesiastical usage and teaching. Absolute necessity, moreover, compelled the bishops to institute young and inexperienced, if not entirely uneducated clerics, to the vacant livings, and this cannot but have had its effect upon succeeding genera-

tions. . . . The scourge must have been most demoralising to discipline, destructive to traditional practice, and fatal to observance.

I think we have said and quoted enough to give the readers of the DUBLIN REVIEW some idea of the merits and interest of this book. In dealing with such a subject, it is easy to become dry and tedious, and the mere task of reducing to something like order the large number of documents that treat of the Plague, scarcely tends to foster in the historian a well-balanced sense of proportion. What to say and what to omit becomes often a matter of considerable difficulty. Without affirming that our author has always successfully escaped from this danger, we may certainly say that he has managed, out of the sources at his disposal, to produce a work eminently readable, full of most interesting matter, and one which obviously reflects the best traditions of the learned Order to which he belongs.

B. K.

Catholic Truth Society Publications. London: 18 West Square.

TO judge from a fresh batch of publications sent to us for notice, the efforts of the Catholic Truth Society to counteract Protestant prejudice and further the Catholic Faith are being well carried on. Abundant and excellent material of various kinds is now provided, and only awaits distribution at the hands of other agencies. It is very satisfactory to find the Society overtaking the work for which it was instituted. A few years ago the complaint was that we had little or no cheap Catholic literature; the difficulty now is rather to multiply means for its distribution. We have sometimes wondered in this connection whether more might not be done for the strangers who sometimes frequent our churches, and who, if these leaflets were given to them on entering, might read them quietly during the service. Such persons are often glad of something to read, and their very presence in church shows a willingness to learn, or at least some curiosity about our faith. Tracts distributed in these ways are more likely to bear fruit than those which are scattered broadcast outside.

The Papers on Nuns of the "Rescued," "Escaped," or "Walled-up" varieties have an interest which, though ephemeral and local, is very keen for a time; and their publication shows how well the Society works up to date. We are by no means of opinion that silent contempt is the best reply to calumnies of this description. One meets too many people who believe these silly charges simply because they have never seen them contradicted; but after the exhaustive and convincing treatment of these fables by F.F. Thurston,

and Sydney Smith, S.J., they ought to be satisfied. Of course it is not every day that a popular author like Mr. Rider Haggard gives so splendid an opportunity for refuting such calumnies, and since his encounter with F. Thurston, that ingenious writer will probably think twice before again rooting in anti-Catholic garbage for the sensational episodes of his romances.

The Historical Papers include a reprint of Father Gasquet's article in our own number for Oct. 1893 on "Religious Instruction in England during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries;" and a popular summary, by Rev. B. C. Laing, of the more important work of the same learned Benedictine on "Edward VI., and the Book of Common Prayer." Amongst controversial tracts we notice, besides several very effective leaflets, Mr. Gatty's letter on "The Revival of the Catholic Faith in England"; and "Why I left the Church of England," by Mr. Britten; both of which possess, in addition to very solid arguments, a personal element which is always interesting. Abbot Snow's thoughtful essays on "Christian Aspects of the Labour Question" are a well-timed reprint suited to a growing class of readers for whose needs we have not yet done enough.

The interests of those of our own household have not been overlooked. Besides some devotional tractates, there are several additions to the Biographical Series, notably a sketch of the "Dominican Martyrs in China," lately canonised; and Mrs. Morgan Morgan's "St. Margaret of Scotland," a charming portrait of the gracious Scottish Queen, much wanted in her own country, where only last autumn the eighth centenary of her death was passed by almost unnoticed. "Westminster Abbey," by F. Gilbert Dolan, O.S.B., is a fresh and interesting lecture full of out of the way lore; it is mainly meant for use with the magic lantern, but would serve admirably as a Catholic guide to the Royal Abbey. Lighter literature is well represented by four tales from Dr. Barry's graceful pen, entitled "The Place of Dreams," in which the preternatural element is introduced in an orthodox, but sufficiently gruesome, manner.

Altogether, although much remains to be done, the Catholic Truth Society is doing an excellent work.

A Life of Archbishop Laud. By "A ROMISH RECUSANT."
London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Limited.

ARCHBISHOP LAUD has had many biographers, from his admiring contemporary, Peter Heylin, to the son of his present successor, better known as the author of "Dodo;" but there was room for the new life which "A Romish Recusant" has just given to the

world. A Catholic is, in some respects, specially well fitted to write of a man like Laud, who though hated for his Popish proclivities, was far from being a Catholic himself, and who has been so much belauded by his own side and defamed by the Puritans that it needs an outsider to judge of him fairly. The present author is well qualified by his past religious experiences, as well as by learning and impartiality, to form a fair judgment of one whom Mr. Gladstone has described as "standing upon the historic stage halfway between culprit and martyr." His work is most readable and interesting. The narrative is never dull, being enlivened by continual references to modern interests, and written in a gay, almost jaunty, style which, if it falls short of the usual solemnity of history, is difficult to avoid when dealing with the vagaries of High Churchism. Take this passage as an example: Laud had to defend himself at his trial

for using certain old Catholic prayers and ceremonies in the consecration of St. Catherine's Cree, and said, "We have separated the chaff, shall we cast away the corn too? If it comes to that, let us take heed we fall not upon the *Devil's winnowing*, who labours to beat down the corn; 'tis not the chaff that troubles him," S. Luc. 22. Exactly; and I have no doubt that it was on this principle that I once saw a High Church Anglican clergyman celebrating the communion service with a large copy of the *Book of Common Prayer* on the desk on the communion table, and a very small copy of the *Garden of the Soul* opened at "The Ordinary of the Mass," lying beside it. I asked him, afterwards, his reasons for this, and he said that he read aloud the prescribed order for holy communion out of the Anglican prayer book, and interposed in a whisper such prayers out of the Roman Missal as he thought good, adding that this was a common practice among clergymen of his school. Like Laud, he probably fancied that he was separating the chaff without casting away the corn, and as to the "devil's winnowing" he would say that of the two books upon the communion table, "it is not the *Book of Common Prayer* that troubles him," S. Luc. 22. Both Laud and my friend appear to have forgotten that such Catholic corn as the Order for the Consecration of Churches and the Ordinary of the Mass had long ago been cast among the chaff by the Church to which they belonged; or it may have been that they were uncomfortably conscious of the fact that the Anglican winnowing machine was apt to scatter the grain indiscriminately with the husk (p. 156).

Archbishop Laud is commonly but erroneously supposed to have "been the inventor or originator of the High Church school of religious thought and ceremony." In reality he adopted its principles from Lancelot Andrews, Bishop of Winchester, and never himself advanced much beyond the practices of that "great light of the *Christian world*," as he styled him. If he were living now Laud would not be considered at all "High," and his theories as to episcopacy and the Real Presence would not pass muster with his present successors; still his lofty position, his energetic, determined character, his influence at Court, and especially his death for the cause,

naturally made him the chief expositor of these views in his own age, and their most illustrious martyr in the eyes of posterity.

Our author deals very impartially with some aspects of Laud's life which have a special interest to Catholics, such as his leanings to the Church and his relations with Catholics of his time. These latter were neither few nor unimportant, though not so frequent as his enemies urged at his trial. Laud had a difficult position to fill, particularly in days before comprehensiveness had become the cardinal virtue of the Established Church. He had to stand well with a king whose wife was a zealous Catholic, and yet to administer the severe provisions of the Penal Laws. His own theological views, leaning more to Catholicism than to Puritanism, were peculiarly liable to misrepresentation by fanatical enemies who were desperately in earnest, and had no idea of compromise in religious concerns. When he persecuted Catholics, it was generally for some political purpose, or to divert attention from his own Popish proclivities. He kept up friendly relations with an old school-fellow, F. Leander Jones, the Benedictine, and with him and others perhaps discussed projects for reunion with Rome. At times he protected both priests and lay Catholics from the severity of the law, services for which he seems to have received some recognition from the Holy See; there was certainly a proposal, when he was imprisoned in the Tower, that if he could effect his escape he should be welcomed and well treated in Rome. The story also of his being offered a Cardinal's hat when he became Archbishop of Canterbury rests on excellent authority; no formal offer of course was made, but it is highly likely that a promise was given by some personage, probably the Queen, of influence to be used for that purpose in certain contingencies. Notwithstanding these facts, which no doubt raised exaggerated hopes amongst the Catholics at the time, Laud, like most of his modern representatives, was far from being a Catholic at heart. Even on the scaffold, as a contemporary wrote:

"His great care was to shield his Majesty and the Church of *England* from any inclination to Popery;" and in his dying speech he declared: "I have always lived in the Protestant religion established in *England*, and in that I come now to die." [Our author adds]: Whatever he may have been, William Laud was not a Catholic, and it is very doubtful whether he ever had much inclination to Catholicism. Protestants, and perhaps Catholics also, when judging Protestants, are apt to forget that a love of ceremonial and ecclesiastical pomp and power do not necessarily betoken any leaning to the Church of Christ. Many excellent Catholics, nay, many Saints, have had no taste for music, architecture, or painting, have cared little for ceremonies, and have shunned all offers of power and place as if they were the plague (p. 45).

Of Archbishop Laud, as of his royal master, it may be said

that nothing so became him in life as his manner of leaving it. Ambitious, self-willed, and tyrannical in his days of power he bore himself with dignity during his long imprisonment and upon the scaffold. It was not unfitting that he should perish in the revolt against Royalty and Prelacy which he had done so much to provoke. The chief supporter of the royal prerogative, and Charles' Prime Minister during the long suppression of Parliament, Laud was mainly responsible both for the excesses of the Star Chamber, and for the unlucky attempt to force the Anglican Liturgy upon the countrymen of John Knox. Crushing fines, imprisonment, nose-splitting, ear-shearing, and the pillory were dealt out liberally to all who opposed him—genial measures of persuasion which Tudor tyrants had bequeathed to their Stuart successors! He had long been most unpopular. "Great praise to God, and little Laud to the devil"—the well-known phrase expressed the general feeling in his regard. When, then, English Puritans, reinforced by Scotch Presbyterians, and supported by all whom Charles' tyranny had estranged, were at length goaded into rebellion, Laud was, next after Strafford, the chief victim of their vengeance. He was fortunate in his fate. The inconsistency of his position indeed pursued him to the end; "he was made to pour out his blood for encouraging 'Romanism,' whereas he died professing himself the best of 'Protestants,'" but even "Romish recusants may admire him as a well-intentioned, straightforward, and manly Englishman" (p. 480); and the dignity with which he died, if not the cause in which he suffered, has half redeemed his many faults, and invested his name with almost the halo of martyrdom. We heartily recommend this volume to our readers.

J. I. C.

The Primitive Church and the See of Peter. By the Rev. LUKE RIVINGTON, M.A. With an Introduction by His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. 8vo, pp. 488. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

IN producing this work, Father Rivington has rendered a notable service to the cause both of historical truth and of Catholic faith. Its title indicates the purpose for which it was written. Last year, an Anglican writer, the Rev. F. W. Puller, published a book which was entitled "The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome." Its *motif* was to show upon historical grounds that in primitive times it was possible to be not only a Catholic but even a canonised saint without being in communion with the Roman Pontiff. Such a thesis naturally opened out a very hopeful prospect before

the adherents of Anglicanism, and the book could hardly be otherwise than cordially welcomed, especially by those who were prepared to read it in the roseate glow of the wish to believe. But in the cold grey light of dispassionate criticism, Mr. Puller's volume reveals itself to the reader, not as a scientific historical study, but as a skilful *plaidoyer*. There is the usual straining of the issues, and the anxious gleaming of items to make up a case; the usual laborious recommendation of the *pros*, and the frigid and listless disparagement of the *contras*; the eloquent and plausible enforcements of the points which seem to tell for the thesis, even when they are insignificant, and the curt mention or quiet ignoring of points which tell against it even when they are important or vital. We all know how any artist may to a large extent produce a caricature by still preserving the elements of the outline while changing their relative proportion. He can do so by making the head of a man gigantic, and his body diminutive, or by making the houses of a landscape abnormally lofty, and the trees abnormally small. Given a certain measure of enthusiasm in favour of heads and houses, coupled with an equal measure of distrust of bodies and trees, and there is no need to accuse the artist of conscious insincerity. The deep zeal and sympathy which Mr. Puller feels for the cause he represents, and which so often and so easily even in the best of us makes up the religion of a thesis, has, in our opinion, led him, in treating of a selected group of the primitive saints, to make the most of their discoverable points of friction or divergence, and the least of their very palpable points of union and constancy to the See of Rome. Nor is the fault of Mr. Puller's work altogether one of disproportion. His arguments, in many instances, are based upon serious inaccuracies as to matters of fact and interpretation, as Father Rivington in his article on the "Acacian Troubles," given in the April number of the *REVIEW*, has already pointed out. Not unfrequently, he treads upon ground from which a closer acquaintanceship with recent research would have warned him off as unsafe and abandoned, and reminded him that the German critic has passed that way. From what we have said, the reader will easily gather both the needfulness and the importance of the work which Father Rivington has undertaken, and very successfully fulfilled. His book is not only a corrective to the one which has happily called it forth, but is a substantive study and exposition of a most interesting part of the field of Church history.

The area covered by Father Rivington includes three periods. The first, from A.D. 96 to 300, deals with the action of St. Clement, St. Irenæus, St. Victor, and St. Cyprian. The second, from A.D. 300

to 384, treats of the Donatists and the Councils of Arles, Nicæa, the Sardican Canons, the Pontificates of Liberius and of St. Damasus, of Gratian's Rescript, and of the Council of Constantinople. The third extends from A.D. 400 to 452, and describes the position of the North African Church in the time of St. Augustine, the Council of Chalcedon, the plot of the twenty-eighth canon, and concludes with evidences of the Eastern recognition of Papal supremacy. We must reserve until our next issue a fuller notice of the materials which are here presented, and of the arguments which are with great clearness and cogency deduced from them. In the meantime, we beg to recommend our readers, and especially the clergy, to possess themselves of the work itself, not merely as a strong weapon of Catholic defence, but as a most useful source of light and help in the accurate appreciation of a series of some of the most critical and formative epochs of our ecclesiastical history.

The admirable preface which the Cardinal Archbishop has written for this work points out with telling force the all-important principle that Catholicity is a possession which cannot be had by standing upon what is essentially Protestant ground, and turning with eyes, however longing and sympathetic, to the things which are Catholic. Any love of Catholic doctrines, imitation and revival of Catholic practices, and least of all any mere affectation of Catholic terminology, will never make any man, much less a communion, Catholic. To be Catholic in the blessed reality and solidity of the word, means moving off the heretical standing-ground, entering into the Pale of the only true and Catholic Church, laying aside the principle of private judgment at the door, and honestly submitting ourselves in all the humility of true discipleship to the Church's infallible authority. Whatever falls short of this is mere diletantism and pseudo-Catholicity. In treating of this, the thoroughness of conversion, the Cardinal dwells upon the need not only of doctrinal inquiry, but of prayer and repentance. We note that incidentally his Eminence speaks a grave word of warning—much needed in certain quarters—against the precipitate receptions of converts, without careful assurance as to their having duly grasped the Catholic principle of Church authority.

J. M.

The Influence of Dean Colet upon the Reformation of the English Church. By the Rev. J. H. LUPTON, M.A. London: George Bell & Sons, York Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

JOHN COLET, Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, and founder of St. Paul's School, is one of the pre-Reformation reformers whom

English churchmen, anxious for spiritual progenitors more respectable than Wycliffe and the Lollards, are fond of claiming as their religious ancestors. In the interesting little essay before us the Rev. J. H. Lupton, the surmaster of St. Paul's School, and author of a *Life of its founder*, suggests several points in which Colet's influence may be traced upon the formularies and features of the English Reformation. Mr. Lupton writes like a typical Anglican, hovering between two schools. He is honest enough not to disguise the facts that tell against his thesis; but he is chary of definite statements of any kind, and his own pages suffice to confute the vague hints and inferences with which he is mostly contented. He repeats (p. 9), for instance, half approvingly, Tyndale's story that Colet was the first to translate the Paternoster into English, and was persecuted as a heretic for doing so; though he cannot be ignorant that abundant materials exist in our national collections, both edited or in manuscript, for refuting so absurd a fiction! It is too amusing for him in these days to include (p. 62) among the better elements in the English Reformation, its learning and its intolerance of abuses, especially as he has just been speaking of the shipwreck made by Lutheranism, and had previously quoted a Protestant preacher under Edward VI. about "the pullung downe of gramer scholes, the deuylishishe drownynge of youthe in ignoraunce, the vtter decaye of the vniversities, and mooste vncharitable spoyle of prouysion that was made for the pore" (p. 56). The common Catholic phrase which Colet uses in his "*Rudiments*" "*under form of bread*" Mr. Lupton finds to be "defective," and quite inconsistent with "the doctrine of transubstantiation as afterwards defined"; though, by the way, transubstantiation was defined in the Fourth Council of Lateran long before the time of Colet or the Council of Trent.

No Catholic is concerned to question that Colet exerted some influence upon the religious movement of his time; the Reformers, for example, adapted his tractates, borrowed his translations, and stole his foundations; but his influence was conservative and Catholic, and his writings and sermons are perfectly orthodox. To turn Colet into a Protestant needs the application to his life and teaching of the process applied to the regulations of his famous school. Among other devotions for his boys the pious founder prescribed the daily recitation of a very beautiful prayer to Our Blessed Lady, as well as one to the Child Jesus; his reforming successors boast of retaining the latter, but have coolly omitted the former. By the aid of similar garbling they may make some of his writings sound heterodox.

An innovator at a time when innovation was often joined with heresy, it is not strange that some suspicion should have attached to

Colet in his lifetime. The friend of Erasmus and of B. Thomas More, he had travelled in Italy under Alexander VI., and had probably listened to Savonarola at Florence; being, moreover, an ascetic and zealous priest, he was naturally eager to reform the abuses then rife in the Church. Churchmen have ever been the severest censors of ecclesiastics. But because he denounced the excesses of his day in an outspoken sermon before Convocation, because, like others of his time, he preferred to endow a school rather than a monastery, because he did not discuss technical points of theology in his catechisms for children, because he lectured on St. Paul's Epistles and encouraged the new study of Greek and the Sacred Text, we are not at liberty to infer that had he lived a little longer he would have died a Protestant. His life and teaching were wholly different from those of the Reformers. An ascetic of austere views and habits who lived and died in full communion with the Papal See, who taught explicitly the Seven Sacraments and the Real Presence, and was most devout to the Mother of God, who when death overtook him had arranged to leave the world and retire among the Carthusians at Sheen, Dean Colet would surely have found himself more at home with the Fathers of Trent than with Cranmer, Ridley, or Parker! Mr. Lupton has only succeeded in showing that Colet was a Catholic Reformer, and that it would have been a good thing for St. Paul's School and for the English Church had his influence over both been more effective.

J. I. C.

Œuvres de Saint François de Sales. Edition complète. Tome iii. **Introduction à la vie dévote.** Annecy: Imprimerie J. Nierat. 1893.

WE have received the third volume of what the *Univers* well calls the "theological and literary monument" of St. Francis of Sales. It is the "Introduction à la vie dévote"; and besides its intrinsic value there is a special interest attaching to this renowned treatise as being the only one of St. Francis's works of which he has issued several editions. The book appeared in 1609. The holy author re-issued it, with considerable additions and alterations, in 1610 and 1616. Of the *editio princeps* only two copies are known to exist; one of them is in the possession of the Nuns of the Visitation at Annecy, where the great work we are noticing is going on. There is also a copy of the second edition in the same monastery. An *exemplar* of the third has been lent to the Editor by Prince Chigi. It was a Chigi who, as Pope Alexander VII., canonized St. Francis; and this venerable volume bears the following inscription

in the handwriting of the Saint, showing it to have been a presentation copy :

Fay Jesus ma douce vie
Que mon ame en toy ravie
N'ay ni plaisir ni support
Qu'en ta triomphante mort.

All three editions have been used and collated in the preparation of the present text. The first edition is considered such a rarity, and also so interesting by reason of its differences from the received text, that it has been thought advisable to print it bodily as an appendix. But the copy from which Dom Mackey has actually printed his present definitive recension belongs to neither the first edition, nor the second, nor the third. It is a unique specimen, practically unknown till now, of what may be called a fourth edition, printed in 1619. It is in the library of the Cathedral Priory of St. Michael, near Hereford, belonging to the English Benedictine Fathers. As showing the very latest corrections and touches of the holy Bishop, it has naturally been selected.

Father Mackey does not agree with those who assert that the "Introduction" was composed at the request of the French king, Henry IV. In his very full and most interesting preface, however, he quotes a passage from the Process of the Saint's canonisation showing how highly that very shrewd Prince esteemed him, and how he wished him to write something which would keep people in the golden mean between too great liberty and too servile fear. Neither is it true that it was expressly written for Madame de Charmois, although it seems certain that it was to her that he actually addressed it, and that she was the *Philothea* of his immortal pages. The truth is, the substance of the book had been maturing in his mind for years. In his intercourse with those whom he spiritually directed he felt, from the very beginning, the want of a treatise which should bring together in a concise and practical form the principles of the interior life, and teach their application to ordinary social duties and intercourse. Writing to the Abbess of Puy d'Orbe, five years before the appearance of the "Introduction," he says: "If I had my papers with me I would send you a treatise which I wrote on this subject in Paris for a spiritual child, a religious, who wanted it for herself and for others." He used to send to St. Jane Frances and to others who consulted him, writings which they were to pass round to one another. Many of these are found almost word for word in the "Introduction"; they were written with the utmost care, and represented his inmost mind and thought; and the "Introduction" itself, even in its first form, was a methodical and comprehensive masterpiece, containing all the elements which he afterwards developed. At last, as early as March

1608, Madame de Charmoisy seems to have had in her hands what the Saint called (after Grenada probably) a "Memorial," of considerable extent, given to her by him in the way just mentioned. This she showed to Père Fourier (cousin of the Blessed Peter Fourier), the rector of the Jesuit College at Chambéry about 1603. "It was he," says the Saint, "who pressed me so strongly to publish this writing, that after having hastily looked it over and made a few additions (*accommodé de quelques petits ageancements*) I sent it to the printer" (p. xvi).

The first edition of the "Introduction à la vie dévote," printed at Lyons by Pierre Rigaud, was rapidly exhausted. We find the Saint at the beginning of 1609 writing thus to Madame de Chantal: "Bring me all the letters and notes I have ever sent you . . . for if I have to reprint the 'Introduction,' they will be of great assistance to me, as I shall there find a good many things that I can add; for the only complaint that I have had so far as to the substance of the book is that it is too short" (p. xviii). And towards the end of the same year he tells his friend Deshayes, "I have added many little matters (*beaucoup de petites choses*) . . . and always for the benefit of those who live in the hurry and pressure of the world" (p. xix). He added the whole of the chapter on Humility for example; he lengthened other chapters considerably, such as those on Chastity, on Recreation, and on Friendship. It is curious to find, from the Saint's preliminary note to the third edition, that, in the second, three chapters were left out by mistake—viz., the chapters on Propriety in Dress, on Desires, and on Having a Just and Reasonable Mind. Two other chapters were omitted in the second edition, that on Abusive Language (which was never re-inserted in the work) and that on Forbidden Games. The latter, although its substance is sufficiently expressed in other chapters, re-appears in the edition of 1616 and thenceforward.

But the grand difference between the *editio princeps* and those which follow it is the change in form and style. The Saint is clearly trying to make the book more suitable to the general reader—to deprive it of any special reference to Madame de Charmoisy in particular. The contents are arranged on an entirely new plan. Instead of three "parts" we have now five, and many chapters are transposed or broken up. Thus the second edition may be said to be the first issue of the "Introduction" as the world has really known it, for although in the following editions many corrections were made, yet there was no alteration of importance.

We have here, then, a reproduction of the masterpiece of St. Francis de Sales in a form which will probably never be superseded.

The enormous researches which have been made by Canon Mackey, and not only by him but by many investigators for many years past, whilst they have brought to light an abundance of MS. material that was never suspected to exist, are not likely to be substantially added to in the future. Beautiful and strong paper, wide margins and excellent print make the book a luxury to the *connoisseur*; although each volume is only six francs to the clergy and eight to the public. The uniform punctuation, and what Dom Mackey calls the "personal" spelling of St. Francis (as distinguished from the spelling affected by his printers and proof-readers) have been here maintained. The notes and *variantes* are abundant and clearly indicated; there is a good glossary of old words; the editor's preface is exhaustive, and full of points that have never been made before—points, indeed, that could not have been made in the absence of Canon Mackey's own discoveries of unprinted materials. Whilst congratulating him, and the Sisters of the Visitation, on this noble volume and on the two which have preceded it, we add our prayer that the great work may be happily carried to a successful accomplishment. Meanwhile, the appearance is so attractive a form of a treatise, of which Olier declared that "each chapter was a miracle," will perhaps have the effect of drawing fresh attention to it and stimulating its study. Most of us have read it once, and are acquainted with its salient features; but it is only by returning to it again and again that we can find out how rich a book the "Introduction" is. It was Pope Alexander VII. who said that for forty years he had had it by him, "reading it day and night and pondering it at leisure, in order that it might become part of himself."

It is to be hoped that this definitive edition of the "Introduction" will be welcomed in this country, where the work was received with alacrity on its first appearance. Dom Mackey repeats in his preface how Mary de Medicis sent a copy, bound in diamonds and precious stones, to James I., who took the opportunity of remarking that he wished his own prelates could write with such unction. But it is curious to find that there exists a proclamation of Charles I., ordering that all copies of the translation of the book should be seized and burnt. Was this because Charles desired to prove he was no Papist? A transcription of the original proclamation in the British Museum would have been interesting. There has been no lack, as our readers know, of Anglican translations; and about twenty years ago the late Dean Goulburn gave a course of lectures on the "Introduction," which were published in 1875.

Greek the Language of Christ. By Professor ROBERTS, D.D.,
St. Andrews. 8vo, pp. 116. Paisley: A. Gardner. 1893.

IN his "Vie de Jésus" (p. 32), Rénan writes concerning Christ:—"In n'est pas probable qu'il ait su le grec." Père Didon (in "Jésus Christ," p. 84) makes the statement that "il ne semble pas qu'il ait parlé le grec." For five and thirty years Professor Roberts has devoted his energies and ability to the task of demonstrating that Greek was the ordinary language of our Lord. No one will deny that he has brought much learning and research to bear upon the question, or that he has brought forward many arguments not only worthy of consideration, but extremely difficult to answer, consistently with the supposition that Aramaic was the language of Christ. Nor can there be any doubt that if it be established that Greek was the language used by our Lord in teaching and instructing the people, fresh light will have been thrown upon the problem of the origin of the Gospels.

We must confess, however, that Professor Roberts has not convinced us, notwithstanding the apparently decisive character of his arguments. It does not seem to us so clear as he imagines that Hebrew was not the language in which the Gospels were read in Palestine in our Lord's time. We mean, of course, in the synagogues. No doubt Hebrew was not understood by the common people; but the Scriptures were interpreted for the people; and there is no reason to suppose that the interpretation did not assume a more or less stereotyped form, even though no formal Aramaic version of the Scriptures existed.

The passages brought forward by Professor Roberts to show that the people were familiar with a written form of the sacred Scriptures seem to us to require no more acquaintance with them than what would be gained by hearing them frequently in the manner mentioned above. When a great intimacy is implied, we are of opinion that the persons who are introduced are Scribes or Pharisees, or persons familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures. Mark xii. 35-37 implies that the people know some part of the Old Testament; but the passage alluded to (Ps. cix.) is one likely to have been universally familiar. When Christ explains to the two disciples going to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 27) "in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself," he postulates no more knowledge on their part than they would have acquired from hearing the Scriptures in the synagogues. Presumably, when Christ uses the words *οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε*, He is addressing learned men (*cf.* Matt. xii. 1-5). The same seems to us evident in regard to Luke xx. 27-28, where certain Sadducees

try to puzzle Christ with a difficulty regarding the resurrection of the dead. This was the point on which the Pharisees and Sadducees differed; and surely, when certain of the Sadducees come to Christ with a clever question on the point, it is no proof whatever that the common people of Palestine were familiar with a written text of the Scriptures. This was evidently a "got-up" difficulty, with the intention of trying Jesus Christ.

We may say in a word, Dr. Roberts does not convince us. Our verdict is "not proven." But our minds are fully open to conviction one way or the other. We have considered each of the texts adduced by our author, and have set down our reasons for not being satisfied with the first four that came to hand. We consider that all of them may be disposed of in the same way.

However, Dr. Roberts' little book is very interesting and very clear; and will no doubt contribute to the final settlement of this important question.

J. A. H.

Cambridge Sermons. Selected and Edited by C. H. PRIOR, M.A.
8vo, pp. 244. Methuen & Co. 1893.

"THE main principle that has guided his choice," the editor tells us, "has been to select those sermons which, in his opinion, are most characteristic of the University pulpit." We need not say that the sermons are characterised by ability and learning. The names of Westcott, Farrar, Kirkpatrick, and Ryle are a sufficient guarantee of that. But at the same time they are not satisfactory from a Catholic standpoint. There is an air of indefiniteness and generality pervading them, which, to our mind, would render them of little practical value to the hearers. Moreover, there is a good deal in the subject-matter with which we are not in accord.

Professor Kirkpatrick's sermon on "The Old Testament in the Christian Church" we have noticed before, in his volume of lectures on "The Divine Library of the Old Testament." To the volume before us Dr. Ryle contributes an interesting sermon on "The Voice of the Spirit of Truth," which contains the dominant Anglican view on the question of Inspiration. The preacher eloquently defends the Inspiration of the Bible, and protests against the idea of its having been affected by the teachings of the Higher Criticism. He maintains that inspiration does not entail inerrancy, and that the sacred writers, though inspired, erred in matters of science and history.

If details in matters of science, of history, and the like, show signs of human imperfections, if errors here and there are laid bare, whether dis-

crepancies in the Gospel narratives, or variations in the Books of Chronicles from the Books of Kings, or defective knowledge of science in the Book of Genesis, we need not conclude that the Scriptures are not inspired, but rather that the gift of Inspiration did not raise the function of authorship beyond the limits of human frailty in respect of these matters (p. 214).

J. A. H.

The Story of Ireland. By STANDISH O'GRADY. London: Methuen & Co. 1894.

A N illiterate bailiff once posted up a notice in Ireland announcing a sheriff's sale. Like a famous French king, Dagobert, with a certain article of raiment which was worn not only reversed but inside out, the bailiff not only affixed his poster upside down, but glued the printed side against the wall. The question then arose, how was it to be read? Various suggestions were made, and it was finally agreed by the wags and wiseacres that the proper way was to stand on your head at a convenient distance, and then the poster could be read. Irish readers will have to stand on their heads to read Mr. O'Grady's "Story of Ireland." We are far from wishing to be severe, as we rejoice to find some little indication among the Irish gentry of a revival of letters, and Mr. Standish O'Grady is a genial and warm-hearted gentleman. But if we allow him to speak for himself, our readers will see a certain Voltairean cynicism running through his book which renders it quite unacceptable to a reverential people. His views of saints are very peculiar.

"He [S. Patrick] was not learned in books, with the exception of one book, the Bible, which he studied deeply and knew well," p. 45. The first member of that statement is not true; and the sub-suggestion of the second is false. "Nor was he a meek man at all, but proud rather in a noble way, and liable to be carried away by great storms of anger," *ibidem*. "Many of our great saints were great liars," p. 46. "Columba, though a saint, was still a young man, was very proud, passionate and arrogant," p. 62. "All these saints, I observe, were awful at cursing, cursed on small occasions as well as great. If a man looked crooked at them they cursed him," *ibidem*. The bards "pointed the finger of scorn at their physical weakness, their fastings, their double-dealing, their quibblings and general untruthfulness and unreliableness, and the people despised them while they feared," p. 67. "Saints, though often clever, show that monastic intellect, in spite of all its reading of old books of other times and lands, was subsiding into dotage . . . the monastic system . . . perverted the understanding of men who lived

under it," p. 68. "The saints were liars," pp. 69, 79. "Adamnan kept a monk to do his lying vicariously," pp. 69, 79. "S. Moling of Leinster was a quibbler and a dodger," *ibidem*, and Ruadan of Lorrha was the same. "No simple truth, honesty, and plain dealing . . . was neither (*sic*) admired nor taught by the monks," p. 69. If the monks read all the books "of other times and lands" the system brings dotage; if they give unequalled proof of art in penmanship and illuminating MSS. they leave behind—*v.g.* in the Book of Kells—an "appalling monument of misdirected labour," p. 64. Even the saints were worse than the Danes. The saints were liars; but the Danes were men "with truth in their hearts." And when we come to Cromwell, he ventures "to predict the coming of a day when his memory will be dearer to Ireland than that of the greatest Irish worthy that we can furnish down to date," p. 132.

We are sorry that this book is called "The Story of Ireland," as there is a different and commendable book of the same name, and it is undesirable that there should be chance of mistake in the young men of Ireland reading one for the other.

But we cannot allow this book to pass through without examining very carefully the grounds for the very striking statement on p. 99: "The Pope gave him [*i.e.* Roderick O'Connor] leave to have six wives, but Roderick was not satisfied with the number, he desired a larger supply." For this we are referred to the Appendix for an extract from the "Annals of Loch Cé," as an authority, and this is the only authoritative reference we have in the book. Turning to the "Annals of Loch Cé" we find the statement there, vol. i. p. 315 [Rolls Series]. "This was the termination of the sovereignty of the descendants of Ruadhri O'Conchobair, king of Erin, for the Pope had offered him right over Erin to himself and his seed after him for ever, and six married wives provided that he desisted from the sin of the women from henceforth," &c., &c.

Now our first observation is this: The "Annals of Loch Cé," or Book of the O'Duigenans, or whatever the scholars may call it, is of very great authority. It comes very closely after the death of Roderick O'Connor in 1198. To this valuable document Mr. O'Grady appeals for a papal concession of six wives. He gives the reference, and thereby warrants us as having read the document. But, alas! Mr. O'Grady's sheet-anchor is an interpolation into the body of the text of a gloss by Mr. Roderick O'Flaherty, and Mr. O'Grady's authority is no longer the "Annals of Loch Cé," which were commenced in the beginning of the thirteenth century and continued down to 1590 or thereabouts, but of Mr. Roderick O'Flaherty, who was born in 1630 and died in 1718. So the first we hear of this

amazing concession is from Mr. O'Flaherty. Now at present we are not quarrelling with Mr. Roderick O'Flaherty but with Mr. Standish O'Grady. Mr. O'Grady should have known that the "Annals of Loch Cé" are silent about the matter, for he is told so on the very same page in the notes of the Rolls Series editor, the learned Mr. Hennessy. There we read that the statement regarding the six wives is a marginal gloss of Roderick O'Flaherty. "The observations 'Roger's Children extinguished,' and 'the Pope offers Roger O'Connor six wives' *have been added in the margin by Roderick O'Flaherty*," p. 314, "Annals of Loch Cé," vol. i.

Where did Roderick O'Flaherty get his information? We cannot say. All we know is that Mr. Roderick O'Flaherty is far from critical, witness his *Ogygia*; that the concession is in his handwriting on the margin, such is Dr. Todd's opinion; and that the four masters who had O'Duigenau's book and copied from it simply pass over as incredible all mention of the six wives. When all is said it is Mr. O'Flaherty's, and nobody endorses it except Mr. Standish O'Grady, and gives us the "Annals of Loch Cé" when he is expressly told that it is not the "Annals of Loch Cé," but Roderick O'Flaherty.

DON ABBONDIO.

The Poetical Works of Lageniensis. Dublin: Duffy. 1893.

ALL the reading world boasts of knowing Michael Angelo as a painter, a sculptor, and an architect, but it is not generally known that he was a successful sonneteer and madrigalist. The Very Rev. Canon O'Hanlon's name was for long associated with the graver pursuits of Irish hagiology and archæological research. He now comes before us as a poet and folk-lorist, and it would ill become us—poet-priests are rare—to pass by one whose pen has served the literary world so well.

We welcome this volume from his prolific pen in the words of a French poet,

Heureuse Scuderi dont sa fertile plume,
Peut tous les mois sans peine enfanter un volume,

and hope that, true to himself to the end, he will continue to glean far and wide for the benefit of future generations, the old remnants, in tradition and stone, of our local history. Irish local legends are on the wane. Where are the thrilling ghost stories, the Mass bush tales, the Pookha, the Bo-Cienthe, the Fiery Harrow, the Dead Coach, the Rolling Barrel, the White Dragoon of our early days? Go into a National School in Ireland and inquire, and you will discover that these delightful legends are practically unknown. If

local traditions are to be preserved they must be gathered soon. Canon O'Hanlon is the writer who, in the present pleasing volume of poetry before us, mostly in smoothly flowing Spenserian stanzas, enshrines some of the best of Irish legends. We have ever believed that an important service can be rendered to literature, folk-lore, and legend, particularly by the cultured and, comparatively speaking, leisured clergy of Ireland. Hence we notice with great pleasure a revival of literary work among Catholic clergymen in the Sister Isle. Healy's "Irish Schools and Scholars," O'Rourke's "History of Sligo," White's "Clare and Dalcassian Clans," and Fahy's "History and Antiquities of Kilmacduagh," are solid contributions to the literature of Ireland, and we may express hope that local traditions and parochial "remains" will be rescued from oblivion by the many graceful pens of the upland clergy all over the land.

Canon O'Hanlon's longest piece is "The Land of Leix." We hope that every Queen's County man who can read will read it. Knowing every inch of the ground, its enchanted wells, its monastic ruins, Clonenagh, Mondraheid, Armathrim—we paid a visit to St. Kevins (Caemhens) Well last summer—Cromogue with its ancient churchyard, we read with the keenest pleasure this beautiful work. With the author's buoyancy of soul we say

Fair Land of Leix, from Mairgy to Alieve Bloom
 I've trod thy brownest moss—thy green Fraughmore.
 Oft grassy vales I've sought where rivers come—
 The Barrow deep, Awnbeg, the Gully-Nore;
 Much have I wandered steepest footpaths o'er,
 Climbed Cullinaghs and Fossey's hearth-strewn hills,
 Viewing along their wild torrents' score,
 'Those hallowed courses traced by gladsome rills,
 Dancing thro' glens or plains their own hoarse music fills.

The learned poet—for poet he is—has given us "The Land of Leix" in six cantos, covering 125 pages, and in it deals with the history, antiquities, battles, ruins, &c., which always, alas! alas! have such a pathetic interest for us. Whether unfolding a vision of prehistoric times, or making an allusion to the grave of a friend of early years, the Canon's pen moves with ease and elegance.

Do you desire a country dance?

but the dance

In wavering movements hailed the rising moon,
 For youth and coupled beauty lively glance
 And step with agile measure to some tune
 With maze of motion linked; nor tiring soon
 White scarfs float o'er fair maidens rounded arms
 Guiding the sportive chain; nor yet impugn
 Those modest pleasures love inspires and warms,
 For still at nuptial feast the graceful Rinca charms.

(Canto I., 127.)

Or a Homeric battle ?

Rude war hath ploughed his journeys o'er thy fields,
And stained thy surfaces with hideous track ;
Spears gleaming bright, opposed to burnished shields
Meet in concussion, answering challenge back.
(Canto I., 17.)

After "The Land of Leix" comes "The Legend Lays"—a variety of legends in a variety of metres. Here we have twenty-four Irish legends gathered from all parts of the country. These may be called the grand classic legends, such as "O'Donohue's Horses," the "Voice of the Clurricane," and the "Fairy Hurlers." Miscellaneous verses and sonnets bring the collection to a close, and the last sonnet on Death closes thus :

Then let me humbly crave with parting breath
Thy mercies great to save, that solemn hour in death.

DON ABBONDIO.

British History and Papal Claims from the Norman Conquest to the Present Day. By JAMES PATON, B.A., Minister of S. Paul's, Glasgow. London : Hodder & Stoughton. 1893.

THIS is a resolute work, written by a man of determination. There is no indecision about him ; he knows his business—he never hesitates—he labels it "Curia Romana—Crux Brittanorum," and he means it. A Scotchman does not want to joke, and so he opens his preface in the following unflinching vein : "If this history has in any fair degree realised the aim of its author it will in course of time be accepted as *a complete* and *final* authority on the questions at issue." And again—"henceforth" (*i.e.*, from the publishing of James Paton's "British History," &c. &c.) "should ignorance misquote, or bigotry misapply, any of these memorable events in our national history, the corrective is here in every man's hand. The records of Parliament are the final authority, beyond which there is no appeal." If Mr. Paton lives until his book will be accepted as a history of anything, we have the gravest suspicions that he is destined to become the last man—when presumably he will accept it himself. It must have been a labour of love to have written it, as it is desperately savage, but we cannot recommend anybody to undergo the drudgery of reading it. After all, Popery on the brain is a bad complaint, and Mr. Paton has got it in such a way that he becomes ludicrous. Cromwell, William of Orange, and a few of that type are his heroes, and he writes to the tune of "Roaring Meg," while as

for the Pope, the Stuarts, the Spaniards, Laud, Episcopacy, he breathes out blood and slaughter with ferocity. Mr. Paton has no balance for writing history, and a fierce style, better suited to an inflamed meeting in an Orange Lodge, will weary a reader seeking information. From beginning to end an intemperate tirade against everybody except the Puritans, a wailing, railing, and lashing like a caged lion, but without the brute's dignity, a taste for fireworks, and a want of taste in language, are some few of the characteristics of these two heavy volumes.

DON ABBONDIO.

L'Évangile et l'Apocalypse de Pierre. Par ADOLPHE LODS.
Paris: Ernest Leroux. 1893. 8vo, pp. 119.

WE have already noticed a work of M. Lods on the Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter. The present volume is the result of maturer study and closer inspection of photographic reproductions of the MS. of Gizéh. As is but natural, M. Lods finds many things to amend in the publications of earlier editors, and is now able to present to students a fairly reliable text, based upon a thorough and lengthened examination of the newly discovered documents.

The volume discovered at Akhim contains, besides the Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter, a considerable portion of the Greek text of the book of Henoch, and also two pages of the Acts of the Martyr St. Julian. Speculating upon the explanation of works so heterogeneous being bound together in a single volume, M. Lods points out that they are not without a certain resemblance in regard to their subject-matter; they are largely taken up with the resurrection, the life beyond the grave, and the mysteries of the celestial world. Such being the case, he suggests that some early Christian had these extracts copied out and bound together, to form a kind of anthology, for his personal use, regarding the life to come.

Closer examination has done nothing to weaken the belief that in the Gospel of Peter we have the veritable work alluded to more than once by Justin Martyr, and which Serapion, Bishop of Antioch at the close of the second century, forbade to be read in his church at Rhossus. It is obvious that our fragment is not the "Gospel of the Childhood," the authorship of which was attributed to Peter by the Arabian writer, Ahmed Ibn Edris. Neither can it by any possibility be the Gospel of Peter, alluded to by a certain Raimond d'Agilles in the eleventh century. This was in all probability a document fabricated about the age of the Crusades.

Was our author acquainted with the four canonical Gospels? M.

Lods is of opinion that he used at least the first two in his composition, perhaps the third; the fourth, however, he thinks he ignored. We differ from M. Lods in regard to the latter opinion, for there are many remarkable resemblances between our fragment and the Gospel of St. John, whilst the analogies of style are not to be overlooked. We do not pretend to give a list of passages in support of our contention, but it occurs to us at once to point to § 5, in which Christ is said to be delivered up to the people, *πρὸ μᾶς τῶν ἀξύμων* (*cf.* John xviii. 28; xix. 13, 14). Again, the Jews are spoken of in our fragment as if the author relied to some extent upon the fourth Gospel, and, finally, mention is made of the apparition of Jesus by the Lake of Genesareth (*cf.* John xxi). On the whole, it seems to us that the weight of evidence goes to favour the view that our author was acquainted with the four Gospels.

How, in that case, are we to account for the fact that the Gospel of Peter is at times at variance with the canonical Gospels? We do not agree with M. Lod's explanation of the fact. He holds that the Gospel of Peter emanates from the body of the Church; that the writer was acquainted with two, perhaps three of our canonical Gospels, and that, for all that, he goes counter to their authority. In fact he is of opinion that traditions of all kinds had grown up around our Saviour's life in the early part of the second century; that these traditions had come to be possessed of considerable weight, and that the authority of the Gospels was not sufficient to have their word taken as true in every case. Hence the writer of our fragment embellishes his narrative sometimes with statements inconsistent with the Gospel history.

To our mind the veneration in which the four canonical Gospels were held throughout the second century is established beyond doubt by the writings of the early fathers. If, therefore, we find a work in which traditions are inserted subversive of the Gospel narrative, we are naturally led to attribute it to heretical sources. In the present instance, we are encouraged to do so on independent grounds. For the Gospel of Peter bears evident traces of Docetic tendencies. M. Lods, indeed, stoutly maintains that the work is not from Docetic hands; but this he seems to us to labour to establish in the face of all evidence. Whether originally it emanated from that sect or afterwards fell into their hands we do not pretend to decide; but that it bears distinct traces of their influence seems to us beyond question.

Such being the case, it is easy to account for the disregard of the canonical Gospels from time to time manifested by the writer of the fragment.

Everything goes to show the early date of our Gospel and Apocalypse, both being works of the first half of the second century. At present it is impossible to determine the exact date or locality in which either of the two had its origin, though it does not seem unlikely that the Gospel was composed in Syria.

J. A. H.

Tatian's Diatessaron. By MICHAEL MAHER, S.J. 1893. The Catholic Truth Society.

THE untrustworthy character of the methods adopted by recent critics of the Canonical Gospels has been admirably illustrated by the publication, within the last few years, of two most important works, viz., the Arabic translation of Tatian's "Diatessaron" and St. Ephraem's commentary on the same work. "Critics" had committed themselves to an extravagantly late date for the origin of our four Gospels, especially that of St. John. Moreover, seeing that the admission of a Gospel harmony, which admitted the Gospel of St. John on a footing of equality with the synoptists not much later than the middle of the second century, would upset that view, they proceeded to deny that Tatian's work was a harmony of the four Gospels at all.

Already, when assertions such as these were being made, St. Ephraem's commentary was in print, but, fortunately for their exposure, out of reach of these eminent theologians. When, however, they were thoroughly committed to their positions, the commentary appeared like an avenging deity, and before long came a Latin translation of the "Diatessaron" itself; and, what is more, from the archives of the Vatican library. The assertions of the "critics" fell to the ground. But more than that, grave suspicion was cast upon their whole system; and prudent men began to say, "Well! perhaps their other assertions will be found equally groundless when more of the writings of antiquity have been brought to light."

Fr. Maher's little work is excellent. It gives a clear and concise history of the different steps that have been taken in the discovery of the "Diatessaron," and relates all that is known of Tatian himself and his work.

It has always struck us as being strange that the "Diatessaron" should have enjoyed such a long popularity in the Syrian Church, to the exclusion of the regular Syrian version of the Gospels, especially as Tatian, even though he were orthodox when he wrote the "Diatessaron," must have very shortly after lapsed into heresy—at all events,

before his work had been firmly established as the lectionary of the Church.

That popularity is not, however, without its advantages for us. It seems to us to be a guarantee that no alterations were made in the work before Theodoret's time. There existed obvious reasons for adopting in the Syrian Church the full text of the Gospels; still for centuries the "Diatessaron" continued to be used. If the authorities at any time considered the "Diatessaron" unsatisfactory, it seems to us incredible that they would have set to work to patch it up. They would naturally, in that case, have taken up the full text of the Gospels. As long as they did not do so, we seem to have every reason to suppose that they used the "Diatessaron" as they had received it in the first instance.

J. A. H.

Dictionnaire Général de la Langue Française du commencement du XVII^e siècle jusqu' à nos jours. Par MM. A. HATZFELD et A. DARMESTETER, avec le concours de M. A. THOMAS. Fascicules 9, 10 & 11. Paris: Ch. Delagrave, 15 Rue Soufflot.

THIS valuable dictionary, the earlier numbers of which we have noticed at their appearance, is making steady progress. The eleventh number carries the work to the word "emergence," so that the early completion of it in thirty numbers, as announced, may be looked for with some confidence. Each number contains eighty pages of large octavo in double columns, and costs one franc; a subscription of thirty francs entitles one to the complete work. The names of the scholars who are editing this new dictionary are a guarantee of its character. It savours of the encyclopædia, as modern works of this kind must, in the large amount of information, historical and literary, grouped under numerous words over and above their mere definition. The origin of all chief words is traced, and their changes of form and meaning within the period specified, with copious reference to the classical writers of that period. The dictionary will represent the latest scholarship. As to its more material part—its "get-up"—a word of praise may be said. A variety of types and an arrangement of paragraphs put into the greatest distinctness, the etymology, the various shades of meaning, and the illustrative quotations from standard writers.

Modern Criticism considered in its relation to the Fourth Gospel: being the Bampton Lectures for 1890. By H. W. WATKINS, M.A., D.D., Archdeacon of Durham, &c. London: Murray. 1890.

THE title of these lectures describes their purpose, which has been well carried out. The first two deal with the evidences for the authenticity of St. John's Gospel, to be found in writers of the first two centuries; here the student will be particularly assisted by the full (and, as it seems to us, conclusive) treatment of the relation of the early Gnostics, and of St. Justin to the Gospel. The third lecture brings down the history of its uniform acceptance by the Christian world to the sixteenth century. In the next two we have a detailed account of the objections raised by modern rationalists; from Evanson at the end of the last century, and Bretschneider in 1820, down to Dr. Martineau in the work he published last year. The best known authors, such as Strauss, Baur, and Davidson are most fully examined; but we believe every opponent of the Johannine authorship of the least importance is referred to, and his views are fairly tested. The result of this examination is, briefly, that the negative critics are only agreed that the Gospel is not by St. John, being diametrically opposed as to every fact and every reason on which that opinion is based. The sixth and seventh lectures deal with the defenders of the authenticity; and here the Catholic reader will miss the names of the principal Catholic Biblical scholars. Schanz and Fillicon are, indeed, just mentioned; but Kaulen, Cornely, and Vigouroux—to speak of no others—seem to be unknown to our author. With this considerable omission, the account is very detailed and complete, and will be of permanent value. The eighth and last lecture is to us the least satisfactory. The description of Ephesus with which it opens, and of the various currents of thought by which St. John must have been surrounded, will be readily accepted by believers, but is too largely hypothetical to satisfy opponents. The latter part of the lecture is devoted to urging that St. John's Gospel needs translating into modern forms of thought, if it is to meet fully the needs of the day. A Catholic will agree, but will ask, what guarantee we can have of the correctness of the "translation" (to use Archdeacon Watkins' own word), unless the translator be divinely assisted? It is the more to be regretted that he has missed this point, because he has grasped, more distinctly than most Anglicans, the fact that the unwritten revelation preceded the New Testament, and that the Apostles did not contemplate spreading the faith by means of their writings.

La Famille Chrétienne. Par le R. P. DE LAAGE, S.J. 8vo, pp. 356. Paris: A. Téqui.

THIS work is composed of a series of short and practical considerations which go to direct the life of the Christian family. The duties of parents, the family trials, the education of children, the instructions which ought to be given by a Christian father or mother, the settlement in life of various members of the family, are all treated in a variety of short and interesting chapters. A characteristic of the work is that the various subjects are treated in the form of prayers or sentiments, which are not preached by the author, but put into the mouth of the persons for whom they are intended. What a young wife should think of her mission; what a mother should say to her sick son; what a husband should think and feel at the loss of his wife; what a mother should say to her daughter; what a father should say to his son; the anxieties of a choice of vocation, are all episodes in the family life which are here put into words, which all can readily understand and appreciate. The tone of expression is naturally French, and has in some measure the usual Celtic tendency to approach all things from the side of the sublime. For that reason we hope that this excellent work may one day find, not so much a translator, as an adapter who will give to the family in this country some such text-book of what to think, and feel, and say as this does to our fellow-Catholics across the Channel.

J. M.

New Light on the Bible and the Holy Land. By BASIL T. A. EVETTS, M.A. London: Cassell & Co., Limited. 1892. Pp. xxiv.—469.

THE following chapters," writes Mr. Evetts in the preface, "have been written with the view of presenting a brief account of the discoveries, bearing upon the history related in the Bible, which have been made during the last ten or twelve years, and at doing this in a simple form, omitting all matters that do not appear to be of general interest." Mr. Evetts has undoubtedly achieved his purpose; and we may say that the volume he has issued to the public cannot fail to interest those who devote attention to the study of sacred Scripture and the discoveries that are from year to year being made in the East, throwing light upon the Inspired Word.

The volume is divided into two parts: the first treating of the history of the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions; the second discussing the recent discoveries that have been made among the ruins of the ancient cities of Babylonia and Assyria.

Nothing more wonderful in the history of literature has been recorded than the manner in which Orientalists successfully accomplished the task of deciphering the venerable cuneiform records and inscriptions. So utterly had all knowledge of the nature of the cuneiform writing passed from among men, that in the year 1700, Dr. Hyde, Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford, published the opinion that the cuneiform or pyramidal figures engraved upon the walls of Persepolis were not writing but simply an ornamental device. A similar view was held by the Abbé Tandeau in his dissertation on the Hieroglyphic Writing; and even as late as the end of the last century Samuel Witte, a professor of the University of Rostock, maintained that we have at Persepolis elementary designs of flowers in bouquets and garlands.

The first important step towards the decipherment was taken by Anquetil-Duperron, a Parisian born in 1731, who, having acquired a knowledge of the ancient language in which the sacred books of Persia were written, translated a great part of the "*Zend-Avesta*." Niebuhr discovered that the inscriptions of Persepolis were drawn up in three distinct languages; and finally, in the year 1802, Grotefend, the son of a shoemaker of Münden-on-the-Weser, succeeded in deciphering in the shorter cuneiform inscriptions of Persepolis, the names and titles of Darius and Xerxes. From that date the work of decipherment has gone on with increasing success; till now, the records of the venerable libraries of Babylonia and Assyria can be read with comparative ease and accuracy.

The light thrown by the recent discoveries in the East upon the pages of the Bible is immense. Much has been learnt regarding the Ur of the Chaldees, from which Abraham migrated into the Holy Land; the table of nations contained in the tenth chapter of Genesis has received strong confirmation; an account of the Flood has been discovered, which bears more than an accidental resemblance to the Mosaic narrative; and finally, the history of the kings of Israël and Juda has been rendered far more intelligible and life-like. For we meet with constant allusions to the Assyrian and other monarchs that fought with the Israelites, among the cuneiform records; and we are now better acquainted with the histories of the Hittites, Assyria, Babylonia, Elam, and Egypt than were our forefathers two thousand years ago.

One objection raised by sceptics against the Mosaic authorship in years gone by can be raised no longer, owing to the newly-discovered records of Eastern history. It can no longer be asserted that writing was not practised as early as the days of Moses.

"Recent discoveries among the most ancient remains of Chaldæa

have proved," writes Mr. Evetts (p. 131), "that the art of writing was practised at a period long anterior to the time of Abraham, in the very country from which the patriarch himself is said to have proceeded. It is now generally accepted that the city of Ur, on the west bank of the Euphrates, half way between Babylon and the Persian Gulf, and represented by the ruins which the modern Arabs call Mukeyyer, was that Ur of the Chaldees where Abraham was born; and inscriptions on clay have been found there which must be ascribed to a date long before B.C. 2000."

We have mentioned only a few of the points in which the new discoveries throw light upon the Old Testament. To any one who is anxious to acquire a comprehensive knowledge of the subject we can heartily recommend this volume of Mr. Evetts. It is learned and instructive, and, at the same time, written in an attractive and interesting style.

J. A. H.

The Comedy of English Protestantism. In Three Acts. Edited by A. F. MARSHALL, B.A. Oxon. London: Burns & Oates; New York, &c.: Benziger Brothers. 1894.

THIS lively little book inevitably reminds its readers of the writer's "Comedy of Convocation." It is written in the same vein of suggestive caricature, and with much of the old felicity. Perhaps its sketches of the varieties of English Protestantism should hardly be called caricatures; their grotesqueness is too true to the grotesque nature of the things described. The idea is to report the speeches made at a supposed meeting in Exeter Hall to promote "re-union" among Protestants. There are seven delegates—the Rev. Sebastian Stole, a Ritualist; Canon Courtly, a Low Churchman; Dr. Wylde, a Broad Churchman; the Rev. Walter Sterling, representing the Wesleyans; Captain Banner, on behalf of the Salvation Army; Mr. Moore and Pastor Dort, who speak for the Sects, Home-made and Imported respectively. The demolition of the Ritualist, who makes rather a weak speech himself, is fittingly put into the mouth of the Wesleyan speaker; and nothing could be more telling or more fair than the long dialogue between these two, in which the claim to be the Primitive Church is disposed of (pp. 51 to 66), or than the subsequent demonstration that the Anglican Church "cannot be said to exist" (pp. 73 to 85). In the afternoon discussion the Salvationist deputy maintains, with much force, that the book called the "Doctrines of the Salvation Army" really represents the belief of all but half a dozen members of the Establishment.

"The Army," says Captain Banner, "does not insist on Sacramental religion; it insists only on spiritual change of heart; and, if I mistake not, the great majority of Church of Englandists are of one mind with the Army in that regard" (p. 107). The advocate for the Home-made Sects delivers a trenchant historical sketch of the treatment accorded by the Anglican Church to the Congregationalists and other early Nonconformists. "Anglicanism," he says, "was *created*, while Non-Conformism was *crushed*, by royal spitefulness, vanity, and immorality" (p. 120). He considers that Dissenters would never unite with the Church of England; the Ritualists are not the Church, but a sect, "just like we are;" the Broad Churchmen are no Churchmen at all, and very often not Christians; and the Evangelicals are really Dissenters, bound in "Pagan slavery" to the British Parliament. He asserts that it was John Wesley who gave life to Anglicanism when it was dead; and the Ritualist follows with a vehement counter-assertion that everything was still dead when the Tractarians came to awaken the country. The delegate for the Imported Sects opens out with a regular "Man of Sin" and "Pope of Rome" tirade, which calls up an Irishman, who, with some difficulty, gets in a most useful dissertation on the Catholicism of England in pre-Reformation times—against the "Continuity cry." The discussion on Continuity is carried over to the evening meeting, when the subject of "Anglican Orders" comes in. The Wesleyan delegate asks, "Can common sense justify the view that Anglicanism was in Continuity from Roman Catholicism?" (p. 194). His sketch of the reign of Queen Elizabeth is excellently calculated to settle this very pertinent question in the negative. We have only indicated a part of the contents of this useful and amusing book, which will answer the double purpose of supplying the Catholic side with good and strong material, and, we hope, of opening the eyes of many who still cherish the conviction that, in belonging to Anglicanism, they belong to "the Church"—or even to "a Church."

La Confession : Pourquoi on se confesse ; pourquoi on ne se confesse pas. Septième Retraite de Notre Dame de Paris. Second Edition. Par le R. P. FELIX, S. J. Paris: Téqui. 1892.

THESE eloquent Conferences on Confession may be specially recommended not only as a defence of Catholic teaching, but as a model for the Catholic preacher and a repertory of suggestive thoughts for pulpit use. The author is not only a man of learning, but still more a man of experience—that experience of the human heart

and life which enables him to unmask the pretexts of infidelity and to taunt the world with its inability to meet man's higher requirements, in the tone that knows it cannot be contradicted. The little volume contains six Conferences. In the first it is shown that the objections to the practice of Confession—even when one abstracts from the fact of its divine institution—do not and could not come from considerations of reason. Confession in all its elements is highly reasonable—to the extent of suggesting its divine origin. The neglect of Confession and the objections raised against it where they are not merely born of misapprehension but are the outcome of passion; the opposition between passion and confession is the subject of the second conference. The third, on the consolations brought by the confessional, is a remarkably able discourse. Confession, it shows, brings a triple consolation, and in doing so meets a triple sorrow of the heart: it cures the pain of isolation, so common to worldlings and so impossible of cure from the world—the act of Confession (*l'aveu*) does this; it cures the hardness which a life of passion induces in human nature—the repentance does this, a repentance of a kind which is found only with Confession; lastly, it cures the pain of remorse—the absolution does this, and alone can do it. The other conferences deal with a contrast between the tribunal of mercy (the confessional) and the tribunal of justice (the inevitable judgment); the effects of repentance and particularly its fruitfulness, in strong contrast with the sterility of all forms of evil life; and lastly, a touching discourse on the Confession and repentance of Magdalen. Much of the unmistakable power of this little treatise is due, after the author's knowledge both of doctrine and of real life, to his frank recognition of the difficulties and prejudices which, whether fairly or unfairly, are undoubtedly felt and do as a fact keep people from confession and fill many minds with horror at the very mention of the practice.

Histoire du Règne de Marie Stuart. Par MARTIN PHILIPSON, Ancien Professeur des Universités de Bonn et de Bruxelles. Tome troisième. Paris: Émile Bouillon. 1892.

M. PHILIPSON'S elaborate work adds three more volumes to the immense library that contains the trial of Mary Stuart by the historians and controversialists of three centuries. There is little prospect of the long dispute being closed. But just now when new materials for history are being brought to light year by year, a painstaking marshalling and weighing of the evidence by a competent

hand will always find many readers, and will interest even those whom it does not convince. The volume before us completes M. Philipson's work, for though it brings the story down only to the surrender of Mary to the English authorities on the Border, this is the end of her reign. If he tells the story of her imprisonment it will be in a separate work. On the whole his conclusions are adverse to the memory of the ill-fated Queen. He supports his arguments with a long array of documentary evidence, much of which he reprints in the original text in his appendix. To discuss the value of his conclusions would carry us beyond the scope of a brief notice. He shows himself thoroughly acquainted with the English and foreign literature of his subject. Doubtless his work will ere long call forth a reply from some champion of the fair Queen of Scots.

The Law of Marriage and Family Relations: A Manual of Practical Law. By NEVILL GEARY. London and Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black. 1892.

THIS book is one of the series of Manuals of Practical Law, published by Messrs. Black, and intended for lay readers as well as for the profession. A large portion of the work is taken up by the chapters on divorce, a subject which is of no practical interest to Catholics, but there is much in the other chapters on validity and proof of marriage, on nullity, dissolution, separation, alimony, and custody of children, as dealt with by the English Courts, which it is useful even for the Catholic clergy to know. A cleric may be well read in Canon Law and in theology, and may nevertheless be very ignorant of the laws actually administered by the courts in the country in which he happens to be. This compact volume by Mr. Geary will at least put the reader on the right track to obtain accurate information regarding the English Courts, for the references are numerous and correct. There are passages in the book which show that the author wishes to prepare for a second edition, and this emboldens us to point out some flaws which might be remedied. On page 32 the author speaks of the Marriage Act of 1835, which made void marriages of persons within the prohibited degrees, such marriages before that Act being merely voidable during the lifetime of the parties. The author asserts that this Act does not apply to India, and he cites as his authority for this assertion the case of *Lopez v. Lopez* (Indian Law Reports, 12 Calcutta, 706). In that case a man married the sister of his deceased wife with a dispensation from the Archbishop of Calcutta, and the High Court of

Calcutta held that the marriage was valid ; but the *ratio decidendi* in that case was that the parties were of Portuguese descent, domiciled in India, that they had followed the marriage-customs of their class, and that they had nothing to do with English law. We much doubt if this case could be stretched to cover the marriage in India of British persons who had not lost their British domicile. Unless the bridegroom, at least, had been domiciled in India before the marriage, we think that *Lopez v. Lopez* would not apply. In support of this opinion we would refer to the case of *Brook v. Brook*, and the two cases of *Sotomayor v. De Barros* in the English Reports. We are aware that those who agitate in favour of the Bill to legalise marriage with a deceased wife's sister say that "Roman Catholics in India are permitted to contract such marriages," but we think that this statement must be limited to Catholics domiciled in India. So limited, the statement is true.

At page 170, in discussing the delicate subject of conjugal duty, the author goes out of his way to refer to the Canon Law, and in a note says that this topic in books of casuistry is "replete with absurd obscenities, and affords an argument against the practice of Confession." This note is out of place in a legal work, and must give much offence to Catholic readers, so we hope that it may disappear in the second edition. The first note on page 173 is even worse. In the text the author mentions that in the English Courts the offence against nature is good cause for granting a divorce against the offending spouse, and he adds a footnote: "The Canon Law considers it a lighter offence than adultery (Sanchez, bk. ix. chap. xviii.), and in certain cases even permissible." This footnote startled us, and on referring to these passages we find that Sanchez teaches the opposite of what is here given as his doctrine. It is impossible to publicly discuss this subject, so it will be sufficient to say that the author has completely misunderstood the passages in Sanchez, and we hope that this most erroneous footnote may be speedily expunged.

The chapter on Modern Roman Catholic Canon Law is fairly written, and will afford information on this subject to many. Throughout the book much mention is made of Catholic usages, and the Latin form of dispensation for a marriage granted by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster is given in the appendices. A most interesting dissertation follows upon the suit of Henry VIII. in the Ecclesiastical Courts to obtain a dissolution of his marriage with Catharine of Arragon. The author thinks that Henry had "an eminently arguable case." When all that a barrister can say of a case is that it is arguable everybody knows what will be the

fate of that case when it comes before a judge. The popular idea about Henry's contention is that the royal suitor contended that the Pope had no power to grant such a dispensation. This is a popular error. No such contention was put forward before the Court of Cardinals, Campeio and Wolsey. The plea was that the dispensation granted had not removed all the impediments, and that it had been granted on insufficient knowledge by the Pope of the facts, with a lack of *uberrima fides* on the part of the applicants for the dispensation. The contention which Mr. Geary says was "eminently arguable" was that the dispensation granted by Pope Julius II. was insufficient because it removed only the impediment of affinity arising from the cohabitation of Catharine with Arthur, and did not remove the impediment of *publica honestas* arising from their marriage. Surely, a weaker plea was never put forward, and the larger dispensation included the less. Another contention was that the dispensation was obtained by Henry VII. from the Pope on the false pretence that peace between Spain and England would be preserved by the marriage of Catharine and Henry, the truth being that the peace between the two countries was not then in danger, and that Henry VIII. was then too young to have ideas on the subject of peace. Mr. Geary says that this contention is founded on common sense, and goes to the root of the matter. For our part we cannot see how an advocate could put forward this contention with a grave face. The Pope well knew the age of Henry, Prince of Wales, when the dispensation was granted, and the Pope must have been well informed on European politics, and capable of forming an opinion on the prospects of peace between Spain and England. It is true that Henry's suit lingered for years before a decision was pronounced in favour of the marriage, but that delay probably arose from political causes.

Though we have differed from the author on some points, we congratulate Mr. Geary upon a very useful book, and if the blots on pages 170 and 173 are removed, we shall have pleasure in recommending this manual to Catholic readers.

The Means of Grace. A Complete Exposition of the Seven Sacraments, of the Sacramentals of the Church, and of Prayer. Adapted from the German of Rev. HERMAN ROLFUS, D.D., and Rev. F. J. BRÄNDLE, by Rev. RICHARD BRENNAN. Large 8vo, pp. 545. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THIS work is a beautiful gift-book. It is richly bound, well printed, profusely illustrated, and has a coloured frontispiece of

our Lord instituting the Holy Eucharist. Its value as a work of instruction is in keeping with its exterior dress. It bears the imprimatur of the Archbishop of New York, and inherits from the original work the approbation of three archbishops and eighteen bishops of various Sees in Germany. It opens with an Introduction on the End of Man, and then travels over the ground with which theologians are familiar in the treatises *De Gratia* and *De Sacramentis in genere*, and in the various treatises upon each of the Sacraments in particular. The doctrinal instruction is accompanied by passages from Scripture, selections from the Fathers, and is further elucidated by illustrations and examples taken from Holy Writ or from the lives of the saints. No doubt this clothing of the Faith with the *non de fide* element of pious beliefs will be well understood by the Catholic reader. Yet to many, in these days of hostile criticism, a word of warning as to the relative value of these elements would not have been inappropriate. We do not wish for a moment to deny the charm and usefulness of concrete illustration, still less to question the important truth that the lives of the saints are the living gospel written in the hearts of men, and the most splendid commentary which the Church has written upon the sacred text. But it is well to impress upon the young man of the present century, who is apt to judge of his religion as a whole, that the post-revelation miracles of which he reads here are not upon the same footing as the truths of Faith—the Resurrection, for instance, or Transubstantiation. In the instructions on the Sacraments there are some points which are open to criticism. On p. 321 it is stated that “The outward sign of matrimony and its matter is the expressed consent by which the bridal pair declare in the face of the Church, before their lawful pastor and two witnesses, their mutual consent to be married.” Doubtlessly, this passage is meant as a description, not as a definition of the matter of matrimony. All the same, the Catholic reader might gather from it that the expression of the consent *before their lawful pastor and two witnesses* was in all cases a part of the matter of the Sacrament! A like looseness of wording is noticeable in the statement of the form. “The form of the Sacrament consists of the words by which this consent to inseparable union is expressed and the blessing by which the priest sanctifies the union.” Why go beyond the theology of the Church and drive in the priest’s blessing as a part of the Sacramental form? The statement on p. 235 that a general confession “is necessary to some Christians and useful to all” would be improved by some qualification such as “to whom their confessors commend it.” Let us say, in conclusion, that the work contains a large amount of excellent matter, and while we should personally prefer that the

author had been somewhat more judiciously critical in his zeal for edification, we should be glad to see a copy of this work in the hands of every Catholic family.

J. M.

Le Paradis Terrestre et La Race Nègre devant la Science.

Par l'Abbé DESSAILLY. 8vo, pp. 320. Paris: Delhomme et Brigueat.

LET it not be any longer supposed that the site of the terrestrial paradise awaits discovery. The discovery has been made, and the fortunate discoverer is the Abbé Dessailly. The news seems almost too good to be true; yet M. Dessailly's hypothesis deserves a patient hearing and demands a careful investigation. The conditions of the problem are sufficiently well known from the text of Gen. ii., viz., to find a river which could be described as "going forth from Eden to water the garden," and which "from thence was divided and became (*hayah l'*) four heads" or branches, whereof two were the Euphrates and the Tigris, while the other two, the Phison and the Gichon, have hitherto defied identification. The real difficulty, however, has lain, not so much in the identification of the Phison and the Gichon as in the discovery of a stream having for two of its *branches* the Euphrates and the Tigris. There have not been wanting interpreters who, regardless of levels and contour lines, have boldly assumed that the Euphrates and the Tigris anciently flowed for some distance in the same bed, afterwards separating again to suit the exigences of Gen. ii. More reasonable is the hypothesis of Franz Delitzsch, who, if we remember rightly, finds the single river of Eden in the upper Euphrates, while the four "heads" are, respectively, the lower Euphrates, two of the canals—natural in origin, though subsequently improved by art—whereby the Euphrates overflowed into the Tigris, and the Tigris itself. Ingenious, however, as this theory is, it hardly seems to satisfy the actual terms of the description. Still less can we accept the fanciful solution of ancient writers (approved by some moderns) according to which the Phison is the Indus and the Gichon the Nile, considered as forming part of an ideal and impossible cosmic river system. M. Dessailly proposes a new solution of the problem which at least has the merit of simplicity. The fundamental mistake which has been made is, he believes, that the energetical explorers have gone *down* the river of Eden in search of four *branches* into which it was supposed to have broken up, instead of *ascending* it in search of its four *confluents*, for such he holds to be the true meaning of *rashim*, "heads." The problem being thus restated, M.

Dessailly finds the single river in the Shatt-el-Arab, the channel by which the united waters of the Euphrates and the Tigris, the Kesha or Gundes (*Gichon*) and the Haroun or *Pasitigris* (*Phison*) flow into the Persian Gulf. The assertion commonly made that these four rivers originally, and within historical times, reached the sea by separate mouths is, he maintains, without serious foundation. The etymological hypotheses involved are at any rate not too violent. *Gyndes* comes at least as near to *Gichon* as does *Ganges*, which Friedrich Delitzsch favours; and if no etymological objection lies against the identification of the *Phison* with one or other of the several rivers *Phasis*, neither can M. Dessailly's suggestion as to the *Pasitigris* be rejected, on *à priori* grounds, as absurd.

But are we at liberty to ascend the paradisiacal river in search of four confluents instead of descending it in quest of four branches? Friedrich Delitzsch would say no. For although *rosh* may mean either a source (*caput fontis*) no less than a branch (*caput fluminis*), nevertheless—according to this scholar—the meaning is here determined by the direction indicated by the words “and there *went forth* a river from Eden . . . and *from thence* was divided,” &c. A serious objection, certainly, and one with which we could wish that M. Dessailly had dealt more at large. The whole question is too complicated for discussion here. It must be sufficient to state that the author deals with many other elements of the problem—the situation of the gold-bearing land of Havilah, the position of the primeval land of Cush, &c., &c.—and finds that his solution satisfies them all. What will be the verdict of the learned upon his laborious study of a question which, after all, must be faced, remains to be seen.

St. Thomas's Priory; or, The Story of St. Austin's, Stafford.

By JOSEPH GILLOW. 8vo, pp. viii.—375. London: Burns & Oates.

THIS little volume contains the history of the Catholic mission in Stafford and its neighbourhood from the days of Elizabeth to the present time. The title of the volume is derived from an old Priory of Austin Canons at Baswich, near Stafford, which became the seat of the Catholic family of the Fowlers, by whom the mission was principally maintained; though the Lords Stafford of the Castle, the Astons and Cliffords of Tixall, and the Beringtons of Winsley also sheltered the chapel at various times. The fortunes of the little Catholic flock are told by Mr. Gillow very fully. In its early heroic age it numbered several martyrs amongst its missionaries, and Stafford

gaol was often filled with its confessors for the faith. At a later and more peaceful epoch the priory became the residence of the Vicars-Apostolic of the midland district. During the gloomy eighteenth century, when indifference and apostacy were diminishing the flock on all sides, the mission declined and almost died out. About 1750 Viscount Fauconberg, of Newburgh in Yorkshire, sold St. Thomas's Priory to Protestants, and shortly afterwards apostatised himself; the chapel was then transferred into the town of Stafford, and the flock held together until in less romantic modern times it has grown into the flourishing mission of St. Austin's. The minute detail with which the story has been compiled gives this volume special value to those who are connected with Staffordshire; but as an illustration of the struggles of our forefathers the work has a much wider interest; and we should be glad if other historic foundations of the same class could be illustrated in the same able and painstaking manner.

J. I. C.

De la Liberté Politique dans l'État Moderne. Par A. DESJARDINS. 8vo, pp. xv.-365. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1894.

HERE is an excellent commentary on Leo XIII's two great encyclicals, "The Christian Constitution of States," and "The Condition of Labour." M. Desjardins does not indeed mention either of these documents; nevertheless, he treats of the same subjects and in much the same spirit. He disclaims any pretension to compose a philosophical treatise. All through he argues from facts rather than principles. He is familiar with the structure and history of the leading constitutions of the world; but his chief admiration and most frequent allusions are reserved for England, the classic land of freedom. His book is divided into two parts. First he treats of the liberty of Elections, Parliament, Judges, the Press, Combination, and Public Meeting. He afterwards discusses the enjoyment of these liberties, under the three forms of government—monarchical, republican, and social. The chapters on liberty of the press and the right of combination may be singled out as favourable specimens of his method and style. He points out that most democratic states, while professing to allow unbounded freedom in the expression of opinion, are careful to add as a proviso, "subject to the observance of the law"; and he adduces abundant evidence to prove that in fact republican governments have been just as intolerant of opposition as any despotism. The right of a number of citizens to associate together for any purpose not criminal would

seem to be one of the fundamental liberties; but no—the dreaded spectre of religion steps in and prevents the democracy from recognising the right. Here M. Desjardins is at his best. In a few pages (169–172) he exposes the hollowness of the objections to combinations, and shows how nothing but bigotry can account for the illogical position of politicians in this matter. The German socialists are not afraid to be consistent; they demand the right of association for the Jesuits as well as for themselves.

The second part is also well worthy of careful study. Shallow observers commonly think that the citizens of a republic must be freer than the subjects of a kingdom, and that socialism would secure greater liberty than either of these. But it is well to bear in mind that tyranny may flourish under any form of government, whether of the one, of the few, or of the many; that a king may be the best guardian of popular liberties, and that the multitude may be the most grinding of tyrants. Here, again, M. Desjardins triumphantly appeals to history. In dealing with socialism he is of course debarred from this method; nevertheless, he makes out a strong case against that fascinating delusion. Perhaps he goes too far in favour of individualism, but of this the reader will judge for himself. The last chapter of the book is an attempt to explain why Frenchmen do not really understand what freedom is, and why they have enjoyed so little of it. This is certainly a bold undertaking on M. Desjardin's part, and is hardly likely to secure him much popularity among his countrymen. He calmly lays bare the crimes and the follies of all classes alike: kings and nobles, capitalists and workmen. The abstract unpractical character of the revolutionary assemblies, the fickleness and impatience of the mob, the overweening preponderance of Paris, the confusion of religion and politics—these have been some of the obstacles to liberty in France. If Frenchmen ever would be free they must walk in the footsteps of their Anglo-Saxon rivals: they must decentralise, they must be tolerant, they must be steady, and, above all, they must learn to wait.

T. B. S.

The Resurrection of the Dead: An Exposition of 1 Corinthians xv. By the late WILLIAM MILLIGAN, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1894. Pp. 246. Price 4s. 6d.

THE twelve chapters into which this book is divided appeared originally as articles in the *Monthly Interpreter* and the

Expositor. It was the intention of the author to collect them together and publish them in book form. What death prevented him from doing has now been done by his friends. The book contains an exhaustive commentary on that chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians which treats of Christ's resurrection and ours; and the manner of our resurrection. We notice, with some surprise, that Dr. Milligan, while mentioning a large number of interpretations of verse 29: "Otherwise what shall they do that are baptized for the dead, if the dead do not rise again at all? Why are they then baptized for them?" omits all mention of an interpretation frequently given by Catholic commentators, viz., that baptism for the dead means the baptism of prayers and penance offered for the souls in Purgatory. To explain baptism as penance is not to put an unscriptural or an unpatristic sense upon the word. Our Lord uses the word baptism in this sense in St. Mark x. 38, and St. Luke xii. 50. St. Gregory and Nazianzen says: "I know a fourth baptism which is by martyrdom and blood. I know a fifth of tears and penance" ("Oratio de Epiphania"). The Scriptures and the Fathers call Purgatory itself a baptism. Thus St. Jerome's gloss upon "He shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and in fire" (St. Matthew iii. 11) is "in the Holy Ghost in this life and in Purgatory in the next." The same interpretation was given by St. Basil before St. Jerome and by Venerable Bede after him. Accepting this scriptural and patristic interpretation of baptism the words of the Apostle would seem to imply that those are baptized for the dead who by their prayers and menaces take on themselves a part of the baptism of fire by which the souls in Purgatory are baptized. That this sense is contained in the Apostle's words seems to be borne out by the following verse: "Why also are we in danger every hour?" that is to say, "Why do I run risks and dangers in preaching the Gospel, if there be no resurrection of the dead?" The sense that we have attached to the Apostle's words are further confirmed by comparing them with 2 Machab. xii. 44: "For if it had not been hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead." There is a very obvious objection to our interpretation, but fortunately the reply is equally obvious. The objection is that when prayers are offered for the dead it is not that their bodies may rise again, but that their souls may be delivered from pain. The reply is that the doctrines of the future life and of the resurrection of the body went together. Those that denied one denied the other; those that affirmed one affirmed the other, as appears from the Acts xxiii. v. 8. We find the two doctrines inextricably united in 2 Machab. xii. 44; St.

Matthew xxii. 32 ; and even in verse 32 of 1 Cor. xv. : " If (according to man) I fought at Ephesus, what doth it profit me, if the dead rise not again ? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." We could not of course expect Dr. Milligan to defend the interpretation which we have given to verse 39 ; but since so much is to be said in favour of it, we may fairly consider it a defect in Dr. Milligan's book that, while it mentions so many other interpretations it should omit all mention of this interpretation. We are glad to be able to say, however, that we recognise Dr. Milligan's " Resurrection of the Dead " as, upon the whole, a very scholarly production.

La Foi en la Divinité de Jésus-Christ. Conférences prêchées à l'église de la Madeleine, Carême de 1892. Par le Père DIXON, de l'Ordre de Saint-Dominique. Paris : E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1894.

THESE eloquent discourses, preached in the Madeleine during the Lent of 1892, have now been published. The preacher dedicates the first Conference to a discussion of the actual position of Christian faith, and proves that it is living and powerful in the world of our own day. He then passes on to consider what he calls the "negations" which have at different times prevailed among mankind and hindered them from believing in Jesus Christ. He insists especially on the negation which distinguishes the present day—that is to say, that suppression of God in all that concerns being, life and morality, which is now the characteristic of scientific thought. The second and third Conferences are thus dedicated to an analysis and refutation of atheistic "evolution" and infidel "criticism." In the fourth and fifth he undertakes to prove the Divinity of Christ by Christ's own life and words. The sixth Conference treats of the difficulties of the act of Faith ; and the eighth—the seventh being a devotional commentary in the Seven Words of our Saviour on the Cross—of the practical means of arriving at Faith. As a whole, these brilliant addresses express once more, with great power, that instructive contrast between naturalism and faith, between humanity without God and humanity with God, which has been the theme of all the preachers. They are full of life, energy, and "actuality," and the practical advice which is given in the last of the series will not prove the least useful part of their contents.

Mémoires du Chancelier Pasquier. Publiés par le DUC D'AUDRIFFRET-PASQUIER. Tome troisième (1814-1815). 8vo, pp. 448. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1894. 8frs.

THIS new volume of "Pasquier's Memoirs" deals with the *annus mirabilis* of modern times. As in the former volumes, the writer does not concern himself with describing the great events which were going on around him. These he assumes as already well known to his readers. His business is rather with their inner history: tracing their undercurrent, laying bare the motives of the men who took part in them, noting the mistakes of both sides, and impartially dealing out praise and blame. Nowhere else can be found a more admirable account of the embarrassments of the first Restoration, the incapacity of the new Government, the mutual distrust and sense of insecurity during the Hundred Days, the arrogance and violence of the Allies, the rage and folly of the returned *émigrés*. All through this portion of the Memoirs Napoleon still stands out as the great central figure. When we learn the difficulties of his position during his brief re-accession to power, we are made to wonder more than ever at the marvels which he wrought in his last contest with his countless foes. But Pasquier lets us see that, in spite of all these tremendous efforts, the disaster which followed was clearly foreseen by those who, like himself, were calm observers of events. With this third volume the first section of the Memoirs comes to an end. The story of the Second Restoration and Exile remains to be told. Although it has in itself little interest, we look forward with eagerness to Pasquier's narrative, and especially to his reflections on the series of blunders which once again drove the Bourbons from the throne of France.

T. B. S.

Science et Religion. Par G. DE MOLINARI. Paris: Guillaumin. 1894. 3frs. 50c.

IT is not easy to say whether a book like this will do good or harm. M. de Molinari thinks that religion is an excellent thing—nay, that it is indispensable for human progress; but then by religion he does not mean the same as we do. Faith and the supernatural have no existence for him. In his view mankind cannot get on without a divinity of some sort, and so it has made one or more gods to suit its purpose. These creations of man's mind have, like his other creations, varied in perfection according to the perfection of their maker. At first a number of higher beings were constructed whose power and sphere of action, though greater than those of men, were

limited, and who reflected not only the physical excellences and virtues of men, but also their vices and passions. As on earth so also in Olympus a struggle for existence ensued, and likewise resulted in the survival of the fittest. Deity after deity was eliminated until at length only one was left who had absorbed all the powers and annexed all the dominions of the rest. Meantime, side by side with this process, a marked improvement of morals was going on; passions and vices gradually disappeared, virtues became more and more manifest. In this way men reached the notion of a single all-powerful, absolutely-perfect being. With this notion M. de Molinari has no fault to find. He thinks that it will do—for the present.

Such is his line of argument, stripped of its sentiment and relieved of a load of matter quite foreign to its purpose. There are in the book some really good chapters on the necessity and the function of religion in social progress. These may do good. Some readers may be induced to lay aside their prejudices, and may even go on to conclusions of which M. de Molinari himself stops short. In any case many sins should be forgiven him for his unbounded admiration for our Holy Father Leo XIII., Cardinal Manning, Cardinal Gibbons, and Abp. Ireland. He is convinced that there is a splendid future for religion if conducted on the lines of these great ecclesiastics. Here we are entirely at one with him.

T. B. S.

Prolegomena to the Study of Hegel's Philosophy and especially of his Logic. By WILLIAM WALLACE, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of Merton College, and Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford. Second edition, revised and augmented. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1894. Pp. 477. Price 10s. 6d.

"THE condemnation," says Hegel, "which a great man lays upon the world is to force it to explain him." Professor Wallace has undertaken to explain Hegel, and his task might be well characterised as a condemnation. In the case of most philosophers, other than German, disputes are common enough as to the precise value of their systems. But in the case of many German philosophers, and notably of Hegel, the question as to value must be preceded by a question as to significance. Professor Wallace is with us when we make this statement.

"To read Hegel," he says, "often reminds us of the process we have to go through in trying to answer a riddle. The turns of the problem to be

solved are all given to us ; the features of the object are, it may be, fully described ; and yet somehow we cannot at once tell what it is all about, or add up the sum of which we have the several items. We are waiting to learn the subject of the proposition of which all these statements may be regarded as the predicates. Something we feel has undoubtedly been said ; but we are at a loss to see what it has been said about."

There are difficulties in the very style. Undoubtedly passages of sterling eloquence may be found in the writings of Hegel (*e.g.*, the passage on Prayer, quoted in Fr. Bowden's "Natural Religion," pp. 259, *seqq.*), nevertheless, we may with some truth say of him what Carlyle has said of Jenfelsdröckh : "Of his sentences perhaps not more than nine-tenths stand straight on their legs ; the remainder are in quite angular attitudes, but tressed-up by props (of parentheses and dashes), and ever with this or the other tag-rag hanging from them ; a few even sprawl out helplessly on all sides, quite broken-backed and 'dismembered.'" But the difficulties lie deeper than the style ; they are to be found in the thoughts of Hegel. Are the difficulties here to be charged to Hegel's obscurity or to our want of vision ? Most would charge them to Hegel's obscurity. But Mr. Wallace asserts that the fault lies with ourselves. It is because in our ordinary habits of mind we are accustomed to inexact thinking, that when we attempt to ascend to the atmosphere of Hegelian thought "we feel very much as if we had been lifted into a vacuum where we cannot breathe, and which is a fit habitation for unrecognisable ghosts only." Mr. Wallace does not express a hope to create in us habits of exact thinking. But his desire is, through his *Prolegomena*, which is intended as an introduction to the study of Hegel and especially of his logic, to at least break the ground and prepare some degree of receptivity for Hegel. If any one can make Hegel intelligible, it is unquestionably Professor Wallace, whose style is as lucid as the style of his master is involved.

The Logic of Hegel. Translated from the "Encyclopædia of the Philosophical Sciences" by WILLIAM WALLACE, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of Merton College, and Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford. Second edition, revised and augmented. Oxford : At the Clarendon Press. 1892. Pp. 439. Price 10s. 6d.

HEGEL divides his treatise on Logic into three parts. In the first two parts he treats of Being and of Essence. Thus far Hegel is dealing with subject-matter which would commonly be assigned to the metaphysic. When, however, we find the third

part entitled "The Doctrine of Notion," we take heart of grace and think that, though somewhat late in the day, land is in sight at last. But when we read, "The Notion is the principle of freedom, the power of substance self-realised. It is a systematic whole, in which each of its constituent functions is the very total which the notion is, and is put as indissolubly one with it. Thus, in its self-identity, it has original and complete determinateness" (p. 287), we feel bound to confess that the apparent land is only a sand-bank after all. The truth is that Hegel confounds thought with thing, and thus with him the science of thought becomes the science of thing. The identification of thought with thing is bad enough, but Hegel commits a greater blunder still when he identifies abstract human thought with absolute thought. According to J. H. Fichte, in this latter identification lies the fundamental fallacy of the Hegelian philosophy. But it seems to us that the identification of thought and thing is the original error. For since it is a characteristic of God that in Him thought and thing are identical, if in the human mind thought and thing are identical, as Hegel asserts, human thought must be identical with absolute thought. And this conclusion Hegel does not shrink from advancing. He denies reality to the singular and grants it only to the universal. The most universal of all will then be in the supreme grade of reality, and as the first in any order is the cause of whatever falls within that order, it follows that the most universal is the foundation of all reality. But the most universal of all is the abstract idea of being as such. This concept Hegel calls the Logical Idea and Divine Essence. "To imagine the being of the world," says Hegel, "is to strip it of all individual and contingent forms and to conceive it as a universal and necessary Being; that is, as God." The Logical Idea is one with the completest unity, and yet at the same time it is all. All other existences than abstract, necessary and absolute truth are mere determinations of this truth, necessary evolutions of its being. They are real with its reality, one with its unity. They are many amongst themselves, they are various, they are diametrically opposed to each other. And yet they are one because they are identical with the absolute. We are inclined to remark that the saying is a hard one and difficult of understanding. Hegel hastens to assure us that it is not only difficult but impossible to understand. But it appears that there is something higher than *understanding*, to wit, Reason, or the "dialectic process." "Thought, as *understanding*, sticks to fixity of characters and their distinctness from one another; every such limited abstract it treats as having a subsistence and being of its own" (p. 143). But "in the dialectical stage these finite

characterisations or formulæ supersede themselves and pass into their opposites" (p. 147). We are curious to know some more about the "dialectic process," and fortunately the definition is at hand.

"By dialectic is meant the indwelling tendency outwards by which the one-sidedness and limitation of the predicates of understanding is seen in its true light, and shown to be the negation of them. For anything to be finite is just to suppress itself and put itself aside. Thus understood the dialectical principle constitutes the life and soul of scientific progress, the dynamic which alone gives immanent connection and necessity to the body of science; and, in a word, is seen to constitute the real and true, as exposed to the external, exaltation above the finite" (p. 147).

Dialectic, or the "indwelling tendency outwards," essays a still more difficult feat than the identification of opposites "in the absolute and the One." It aims at identifying Absolute Being with Absolute Nothing. "If we enunciate Being," says Hegel, "as a predicate of the Absolute, we get the first definition of the latter. The Absolute is Being. This is—in thought—the absolutely initial definition, the most abstract and stunted" (p. 158).

"But this mere Being, as it is a mere abstraction, is therefore the absolutely negative; which, in a similarly immediate aspect, is just Nothing. Hence was derived the second definition of the Absolute; the Absolute is the Nought. In fact, this definition is implied in saying that the thing in itself is the indeterminate, utterly without form and so without content" (p. 161).

For the good name of the centuries which preceded the birth of Hegel, we should be glad to give credit for originality to the German philosopher when he states that Absolute Being is Absolute Nothing. But we learn regretfully from Aristotle that the same weighty proposition had been laid down by Heraclitus. However, there is at least no indication that Heraclitus was led to this conclusion by dialectic, or the "indwelling tendency outwards." Hegel's arguments, thrown into syllogistic form, would run as follows: Absolute Being is absolute indetermination. But absolute indetermination is Absolute Nothing. Ergo, Absolute Being is Absolute Nothing. Clearly this reasoning is sophistical. The term "indetermination" is used in the argument in a double sense. Absolute Being is indeterminate as excluding *determinate* entity, whether generic, specific, or individual; but *not* as *totally* excluding entity real and ideal; rather as necessarily involving entity. But Absolute Nothing is indeterminate as excluding *all* entity whether real or ideal. We are not surprised to find Hegel himself describing his system as a "realm of shadows." Still less are we surprised to find Schopenhauer pouring the vials of his contempt on the "dialectic process."

"The lowest stage of degradation," says Schopenhauer, "was reached by

Hegel, who, to stifle again the freedom of thought won by Kant, turned Philosophy, the daughter of Reason and future mother of Truth, into an instrument of obscurantism and Protestant Jesuitism, but in order to hide the disgrace and at the same time stupefy men's brains to the utmost, drew over her a veil of the emptiest verbiage and most senseless hodge-podge ever heard out of Bedlam."

Nevertheless, although Hegel so sadly misused his powers he was undoubtedly a vigorous thinker. His philosophy, which had once such widespread acceptance in Germany that it even influenced the teaching of Catholic theologians like Günther, has now little recognition in the land of its birth. But in England, where, to this day, Hegelianism has many brilliant disciples and exponents, the "logic" is still a force to be reckoned with. And those that wish to make an acquaintance with this famous "logic" cannot better study it than in the excellent translation of Professor Wallace.

The Supernatural in Christianity, with special Reference to Statements in the recent Gifford Lectures. By Principal RAINY, D.D., Professor J. ORR, D.D., and Professor MARCUS DODS, D.D., with a Prefatory Statement by Professor A. H. CHARTERIS, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1894. Pp. 111. Price 2s.

IT was commonly understood that the foundation deed of the Gifford lectures authorised the discussion of Theism on grounds of Natural Reason alone, and that Supernatural Revelation was to have no place in the lectures whether as object of attack or of defence. The lectures, in point of fact, have never been used as an instrument for the defence of Supernatural Religion; but in those recently delivered by Dr. Pfleiderer, the well known Berlin professor, the supernatural aspects of Christianity were assailed. The Incarnation was set aside, the miracles recorded in the Gospels discarded, and our Lord was represented as a Redeemer, only in the sense in which any one who lives his life in a manner that tends to elevate the lives of others deserves to be called a redeemer. It seemed to many that lectures of this nature were inconsistent with the terms of the Gifford bequest. In any case such lectures as Dr. Pfleiderer's could not be permitted; in a Christian country, to pass without protest. A course of three lectures in reply was accordingly organised without delay. The lectures have now been published under the title of "The Supernatural in Christianity." All three lectures are remarkably well written and frequently exhibit great power. The lecture on "The Trustworthiness of the Gospels," by

Professor Dods, is perhaps the one that will be read with more general interest.

Rational Philosophy, the Laws of Thought, or Formal Logic.

A brief, comprehensive Treatise on the Laws and Methods of Correct Thinking. By WITHAM POT POLAND, Professor of Rational Philosophy in St. Louis' University. New York, Boston, Chicago: Silver, Burdett & Co. 1892. Pp. 104.

WE think that Mr. Poland would have done well to add a few lines on "appellation" when he is treating of the use of terms. We think, too, that he has ill-described the universal. "What is it?" he asks. "It is a convenience invented by the ingenuity of the mind for the needs of thought." This is clearly no description of the direct and fundamental universal. But if there are some few defects, there are at the same time many excellences in this very valuable little treatise. With the exception of the description given of the universal, Mr. Poland is soundly Aristotelian throughout; and if he ill-describes the universal, it is, we believe, because he is for the moment sacrificing thoroughness for the sake of brevity. But no similar fault occurs elsewhere. There is almost always brevity, but it is the brevity of concentration and strength, which increases rather than detracts from clearness. Our author writes on "incomplete induction" at somewhat greater length than he usually allows himself. But what he says is so good that we could not afford to miss a word of it. We should be very glad to quote from this passage; but the passage would suffer from dismemberment, and the space at our disposal will not permit us to quote it in its entirety. Mr. Poland could not possibly have said more than he has said in the hundred and four pages of his treatise, and he could scarcely have said it better. If "Logic" is to form part of the ordinary curriculum of the Catholic higher schools of this country, there is no manual that we can recommend with greater confidence than the "Formal Logic" of Mr. Poland.

Ethic of Benedict de Spinoza. Translated by W. HALE WHITE and AMELIA H. STIRLING. Second Edition. Revised and Corrected, with new Preface. London: T. Fisher Unwin, Paternoster Square. 1894. Pp. 402. Price 7s. 6d.

DESCARTES had defined substance as "a thing which exists in such wise that it needs no other thing for its existence." This definition is false, for substance as such neither includes nor excludes

dependence from an efficient cause of its being ; all that is involved in the essential concept of substance is that it exists by itself and does not inhere in something else as in a subject of inhesion. In other words, while *perseity* necessarily forms part of the content of substance, *aseity* does not. The definition of Descartes, however, ascribes *aseity* as well as *perseity* to substance. There is, indeed, no reason to believe that Descartes was what would now be called a Monist. It is probable that when defining substance he had in view the Divine substance—that he was perfectly willing to grant the existence of a number of other substances which, while excluding a subject of inhesion, admit and require an efficient cause. But however this may be, Spinoza, taking the definition of Descartes as the foundation of his Pantheistic system, teaches in his “Ethic” that there is only one substance—God ; and since no attribute can exist without existing in substance, whatever exists is in God, is an affection, mode, and manifestation of the Divine substance ; that the manifestations of God being not external to the Divine substance but immanent, they are a necessary evolution of the Divine nature, and thus there is no such thing as free will either in the organ of the manifestations (*natura naturans*) or in the manifestations themselves (*natura naturata*). It can scarcely be claimed for Spinoza that he is original. The definition of substance which lies at the basis of his system he borrowed from Descartes. The argument with which he attempts to vindicate this definition is remarkably like one that was advanced by the Materialist, David of Dinanto, and victoriously refuted by St. Thomas. Then, again, just as Descartes made extension the essence of body, and thought the essence of spirit, Spinoza chooses extension and thought as the two modes of his only substance, which is at once body and spirit. But if Spinoza be not original, it is claimed that he is at least consecutive and consistent. It would be difficult to justify this claim. Spinoza says : “By substance I understand that which is in itself and is conceived through itself ; in other words, that the conception of which does not need the conception of another thing from which it must be formed.” Now thought can be conceived without extension, and extension can be conceived without thought. Consequently, if the definition of Spinoza be the correct one, instead of one only substance, there must be at least two distinct substances—thought and extension. Once more ; is the substance of which thought and extension are the two modes spiritual, or is it material ? If it be material, how shall we account for thought ? If it be spiritual, how shall we account for extension ? Spinoza’s way of meeting the difficulty is to increase it. He declares that the substance is at once

spiritual and material. "Substance thinking," says Spinoza, "and substance extended are one and the same substance, which is now comprehended under this attribute, now under that." Mr. White attempts to illustrate this. "The idea of a circle," he says, "and the circle itself are one. Revealed as thought we have the former; revealed as extension we have the latter." (Preface, p. lxxv.) But what is the precise meaning of revelation which excludes thought and idea? Then, again: it is conceivable that a varied world should be the product of an absolute unity which is distinct from it; but how shall a varied world be produced within the absolutely one? Such was the question which De Ischirnhausen put to Spinoza. The question was acknowledged and an answer promised; but the answer never came. But although Spinoza was neither an original nor a consistent thinker, still, if Goethe can write, "The mind which worked upon me so decisively, and which was destined to affect so deeply my whole mode of thinking, was Spinoza," the great founder of modern Pantheism can have been no common man. The lengthy Preface which Mr. White adds to his translation of the "Ethic" is of great value from both a biographical and a critical point of view. We cannot, however, agree with him when he represents the ontological as the less important portion of the "Ethic." The ontological portion not only contains the doctrines with which the name of Spinoza is most commonly associated, but it also lies at the basis of the greater part of the "Ethic."

Carmina Mariana: An English Anthology, in Verse, in honour of, or in relation to, the Blessed Virgin Mary. Collected and Arranged by ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. Second Edition. 8vo, pp. xxxii.—461. London and New York: Burns & Oates. 1894.

THIS second edition of Mr. Orby Shipley's interesting and learned collection of verses on Our Lady contains several additions and improvements. The contents have been printed in a different way, with a variation of type, and a footnote, which will facilitate reference to them. An excellent Index of Authors has been supplied. A number of passages are given in the Appendix from various reviews of the first edition by journals, Catholic and non-Catholic. These extracts show that the volume has excited much interest in every direction. "'Carmina Mariana,'" says the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, "includes so many beautiful things, and is of so unique a character, that it ought to find a place on many other than Catholic shelves." Other leading papers speak in the same sense.

Social Evolution. By BENJAMIN KIDD. London: Macmillan & Co. 1894. Pp. 348.

THERE are few publications of more burning interest at the present day than those which deal with the social question. And of the immense number of essays and articles, pamphlets and books on this topic that are constantly pouring forth from the printing press, it would be hard to find one of such originality and interest as "Social Evolution," by Mr. Benjamin Kidd.

Mr. Kidd writes clearly and succinctly, and with considerable force and power; and even where we do not altogether agree with his conclusions, we are compelled to admit that his arguments are full of suggestion.

The writer is an out-and-out evolutionist, and firmly believes in the theory of development, even as applied to man's social relations and domestic life and condition.

It would be impossible to summarise the contents of this large volume of three hundred and fifty pages in the small space allotted to a review; but the main features of the work may be pointed out in a few lines.

He maintains that there is no real advance possible without struggle, contention, and a process of continuous rivalry. Where the "struggle for existence" relaxes, there the rate of progress relaxes also; when the "struggle for existence" altogether ceases, there progress first slackens, and then changes into a retrograde movement. In fact, so soon as man finds himself in such a condition that there is no longer any need for a struggle, so soon as there are no competitors to outstrip, decadence and degeneracy inevitably result. Like a boat upon a fast-running stream, he is carried down to a lower and lower level so soon as his conditions of life allow him to retire from the battle-field of social contest, and to live at peace with his neighbour.

If the struggle grows keener and more energetic, progress will tend to become more and more marked. The question then arises: Will the "struggle for existence" become keener as time goes on, or will it gradually relax?

Mr. Kidd gives a most emphatic affirmative answer to the first alternative. He maintains that the struggle will become more vehement, but that it will be freed in great measure from the ruinous consequences that it now inflicts upon the masses of unsuccessful runners in life's race.

The tendency in these days is to bring about a greater social equality among all men. In other words, all men, on entering the

race of life, will start fairer, and with a more equal chance of success. The result will be a keener rivalry, a more closely contested race, and consequently a far greater general progress; while, at the same time, the distance between the various competitors will be less excessive and less disastrous than heretofore. And this seems reasonable enough, for while it is certainly true that the advance is ever greatest when the struggle is greatest, it is equally true that the struggle is greatest (not precisely where the number is most considerable) but rather where the combatants are most equally matched.

And, if we are to believe Mr. Kidd, it is just precisely this increasing equality of conditions that marks our present day growth.

We see that under all the complex appearances our western civilisation presents, the central process working itself out in our midst is one which is ever tending to bring, for the first time in the history of the race, all the people into the competition of life on a footing of equality of opportunity.—P. 327.

But whatever tends to bring about a greater degree of equality will, at the same time, give impetus to the contest of man with man, and push on the development of the race to a further point of perfection. Now what is the potent factor in this tendency? It is not intellect, it is not interest, it is not the inevitable submission of the weak to the stronger, for all the concessions are on the more powerful side. What, then, is it? It is, says Mr. Kidd, the growth and expansion of the social virtues. It is the necessary outcome of religion in some form or another; of the belief in the inherent equality of man, and the brotherhood of the entire race, irrespective of country or colour. "The Social question is at bottom a religious question" (p. 13). In human evolution, the function of all supernatural belief must be "to provide a *super-rational* sanction for that large class of conduct in the individual necessary to the maintenance of the development which is proceeding, but for which there can never be, in the nature of things, any *rational* sanction" (p. 100). In other words, faith and sympathy, and a constantly expanding and strengthening spirit of philanthropy, are evidently at work breaking down the barriers between class and class, and reducing and filing down to a finer and more insignificant point the privileges and exemptions of the more favoured sections of the community. We can see this reflected in the whole history of modern legislation. This history

may be summed up in a few words. It is simply the history of a continuous series of concessions, demanded and obtained by that party which is, undoubtedly, through its position, inherently the weaker of these two, from that power-holding party which is equally unmistakably

the stronger. There is no break in the series; there is no exception to the rule.—P. 175.

This process of levelling will go on steadily, to the great advantage of the whole human family.

The inherent tendency of the social development now taking place amongst us, is to raise this rivalry to the very highest degree of efficiency as a condition of progress, by bringing all the people on a footing of equality, and by allowing the freest possible play of forces within the community, and the widest possible opportunities for the development of every individual's faculties and personality.—P. 238.

Mr. Kidd's picture of the future is certainly one of the brightest and cheeriest that we have contemplated for a long time. Without violence, without revolution, without internecine wars, the world is to be wafted into a haven of peace and plenty, secure from the storms and tempests that have rocked its childhood, and to know at last happy days and prosperous seasons. How far Mr. Kidd's theories and arguments may be relied upon, we must leave the gentle reader to judge. Whether agreeing with him or not, no one can read the essay without obtaining a firmer grasp of an important subject, and without feeling his interest in it awakening and intensifying from the first page to the last.

Health at School considered in its Mental, Moral, and Physical Aspects. By CLEMENT DUKES, M.D., B.S. Lond.
London: Rivington, Perceval & Co. 1894.

THAT this book should have reached a third edition is a sufficient proof of the interest taken by the modern public in everything connected with the health of their children when at school. Whatever the author has to say, we may always know that he is speaking with the authority warranted by an experience extending over many years at one of the largest of the English Public Schools. The book is, in truth, more comprehensive than its name implies, and many things are discussed with respect to the public school system which can only be indirectly connected with health. Thus, the curriculum of studies, the rules of discipline, the distribution of work and the length of vacations, and many other such details, find a place. Much of what he says does not apply to Catholic schools, where the system differs materially from that of non-Catholic, whether public or private; but a great deal is left which is applicable, and whether we can accept all his conclusions or not, they are well thought out, and the points he discusses are worthy of close attention.

The Little Sisters of the Poor. By MRS. ABEL RAM. London: Longmans. 1894.

THE story of the foundation and development of that wonderful Order which appeals to the sympathy of Christians of all persuasions has in these pages all the interest of romance. The parable of the grain of mustard seed receives one more illustration in the growth of an institution which, founded less than fifty years ago by a young village curate with no resources save his stipend of £16 a year, assisted by two poor seamstresses and a peasant woman, has covered the whole earth with its branches, and taken its place among the most beneficent creations of Catholic faith. It has now 250 houses, of which twenty-nine are in the United Kingdom, and gives food and shelter to over 33,000 of the aged and indigent poor of both sexes. The name of the humble servant woman who was its first alms-gatherer is so closely interwoven with its early history that its sisters throughout Brittany are still known as "Jeanne Jugans," and a street in St. Servan is called after this lowliest of its inhabitants. Here in a wretched attic the Abbé Le Pailleur placed his two young novices with Jeanne as their matron, and hither, in October 1840, they brought the two old women who were the first pensioners of the Little Sisters of the Poor. During this time the two girls still pursued their calling as seamstresses, while Jeanne, by various forms of service, earned wages which also went into the common fund. With every extension of the undertaking fresh help was forthcoming for it, and thus it progressed from a garret to a basement, and then to a house built for it by the charity of the public. Now the Little Sister, with her basket or her cart, is a familiar figure in every large city, and the Abbé Le Pailleur has lived to see the great idea with which heaven inspired him realised to an extent that prophetic vision alone could have foreseen.

Reviews in Brief.

The Life and Glories of Saint Joseph. By EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON, M.A. Second Edition. London: Burns & Oates. Dublin: M. B. Gill & Son. 1891.—It is with unmixed pleasure that we welcome a second edition of “The Life and Glories of St. Joseph,” the volume which so fittingly closed the series of Mr. Healy Thompson’s excellent biographies. The earlier edition we reviewed in our issue of July 1888, and little need be added now to the encomiums then pronounced upon the volume in this and similar periodicals. The exactness and solidity of the doctrinal portions of the work, the clear and exhaustive handling of its historical and more devotional parts, the interesting inquiries into the *Cultus* of the Saint in the Early Church, and of its rapid development in later times, and the practical application of devotion to the holy patriarch to the needs of Catholics in the present day, were claims upon the attention of the public which have been deservedly responded to. Now that the Supreme Pontiff happily reigning has added to the titles of Patron and Protector of the universal Church and to the glories implied therein, by proposing St. Joseph to us as the special patron of the Christian Family, and as a bulwark against the disruption in these Socialistic times of that the most fundamental principle of Christian Society, we can only hope that so timely a republication of the “Life and Glories of St. Joseph” will meet with a redoubled welcome, that very many will peruse its interesting pages, and meditate upon its soul-nourishing thoughts.

The New Month of Mary. St. FRANCIS of Sales.

The New Month of St. Joseph. St. FRANCIS of Sales. London: Burns & Oates; New York: Benziger Brothers. 12mo, pp. 141, 155. 2s. each.—Two small manuals compiled from the work of St. Francis of Sales by a Sister of the Visitation at Baltimore, and approved by Cardinal Gibbons. They contain an exercise for each day of the month, a text, a short meditation, and an example. They are sufficiently portable to be easily carried about the person during the whole month of May or March, and clients of Our Lady and the Foster-Father of Christ could hardly have a better companion.

The Following of Christ. Translated by Right Rev. Dr. CHALLONER. London: Art and Book Company, 12mo, pp. 204.—Neither the work nor the translation needs any recommendation. The print is rather small and much too close, a defect due no doubt to the laudable desire of bringing out the work at so small a price as 4*d.*

Father Faber's May Book. Compiled by an Oblate of Mary Immaculate. London: Burns & Oates. 12mo, pp. 108.—In this work selections have been made for each day of the month from the writings of Father Faber. As such it needs no commendation. Our Blessed Lady has here laid at her feet the Catholic homage of one of the most fervent amongst the multitude of her children who have "called her blessed." It only remains to express our gratitude to the Oblate Father who has so happily compressed this selection of Father Faber's May thoughts in such a compass as to be easily placed in the hands of the faithful during the Month of Mary.

The Perfection of Man by Charity: A Spiritual Treatise. By Fr. H. REGINALD BUCKLER, O.P. Second Edition. London: Burns & Oates; New York, &c.: Benziger Brothers.—This most useful *répertoire* of spiritual science, made up in great measure of the very words of saints and masters, has reached a second edition, and it is pleasing to be able once more to recommend it to priests, to religious preachers, and to all who pursue the study of perfect life.

Explanation of Deharbe's Small Catechism. By JAMES CANON SCHMITT, D.D. Translated from the seventh German edition. Freiburg im Breisgau: B. Herder. 1894.—A reprint of the translation of the "Explanation of Deharbe's Small Catechism," a well known and useful work. This English version had the approval of the present Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster when Bishop of Salford (1891).

History of the Passion. By the Rev. ARTHUR DEVINE, Passionist. Second Edition. London: Burns & Oates; New York, &c.: Benziger Brothers. 1894.—This narrative of the sufferings of Christ and of the dolours of Mary, with notes and comments, is reprinted. It is useful and seems to be popular. One or two mistakes might have been corrected, such as "Maunday" for "Maundy."

The Christ has Come. The Second Advent an Event of the Past. By E. HAMPDEN-COOK, M.A. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co., Limited. 1894. Pp. 163.—Mr. Hampden-Cook wishes to persuade us that we do wrong to look

forward to a second coming of Christ, that such an expectation finds no warrant in any reasonable interpretation of the New Testament.

No event of the past [says Mr. Cook] can be more sure to the Christian than the fact that Our Lord personally returned to earth at the close of the Jewish dispensation. Our knowledge of it rests not on ordinary human testimony, but on the clear, emphatic, and continually repeated prediction of Jesus that such would be the case (p. 73).

The second advent it seems was realised "by Our Lord's personal appearance on the clouds of heaven in 70 A.D." Mr. Cook endeavours to prove this from various passages in the Gospels and Epistles. Of the writers that with the help of private judgment elicit such theories as this from the Scriptures we can only say in the words of Dante, "*non ragionam de lor ; ma guarda e passa.*"

Natal Astrology. By G. WILDE and J. DODSON. To which is appended **The Soul and the Stars**, by A. G. TRENT. The Occult Book Company, 6 Central Street, Halifax, Yorks. 1894. Pp. 245.—A horoscope—*i.e.*, a "map, chart, or figure of the heavens for the moment of a birth"—"proclaims" according to the authors of "**Natal Astrology**," the mental and physical qualities of the native, indicating clearly the disposition, strength of intellect, nature of constitution and health, and, to a considerable degree, the physique and personal appearance. It also typifies the circumstances of the person's life, prefiguring the pecuniary prospects, &c. &c. Our authors provide us with horoscopes of various notable personages, of Frederick the Great, Washington, Napoleon, Mr. Gladstone, and others. "My Cid, who was born under a happy star," says the old Spanish Chronicles of Ruy Diaz. Let no man say of Mr. Gladstone that he was born under a happy star! Reading his horoscope under the skilful guidance of Messrs. Wilde and Dodson, we find that this particular native is, or at least ought to be, noted for "craft, instability, fickle judgment," that he is "haughty and self-assertive," that there is a "daring arrogance about him"; and we notice too that "Capricorn's tail, said to bring danger from wild beasts, is conjoined with Mars, which may bring to the student's mind the historic attack upon Mr. Gladstone by a cow." *Risum teneatis, amici!*

The Life of St. Philip Neri, Apostle of Rome. By ALFONSO CARDINAL CAPECELATRO, Archbishop of Capua. Translated by THOMAS ADLER POPE, M.A., of the Oratory. Second Edition. Two volumes. London: Burns & Oates; New York, &c.: Benziger Brothers. 1894.—This reprint of a well known and highly appreciated life need only be announced.

The Bells of Nôtre Dame of Bruges. By the Rev. MICHAEL F. HORGAN. London & Leamington: Art and Book Company. 1894.—The beautiful story of San Giovanni Gualberto is here adapted to a poetic framework, and the act of forgiveness associated with his name made the starting-point of the career of sanctity both of a Belgian missionary and of his pardoned foe. The story is told in fluent verse with considerable descriptive power, and the chimes of Nôtre Dame of Bruges form a sort of refrain or accompaniment to the tale.

Life of the Princess Borghese née Gwendalin Talbot. By the CHEVALIER ZELONI. Translated by LADY MARTIN. London: Burns & Oates. 1894.—The story of a life which, though cut short at two and twenty, left enduring memories of sanctity and love, is told here with sympathy and feeling. The death in October 1840, of Gwendalin, Princess Borghese, followed within a month by those of her three little sons, left the poor of Rome bereaved of their best benefactress, and her name is still intertwined with popular legends of miracle and wonder.

Naguère, Aujourd'hui. Par Mme. la COMTESSE DE BEAUREPAIRE DE LOUVAGNY. Paris: Téqui, Libraire-Éditeur. 1894.—The scene of this interesting tale is laid in a French provincial town, and it gives a vivid picture of the social and political intrigues by which an anti-Christian government tyrannises over the consciences of the people. A sanguinary outbreak amongst the Socialistic workingmen gives the ostracised partisans of religion the opportunity of heaping coals of fire on the heads of their persecutors by sheltering and attending them in their misfortunes, while the eventual triumph of good is brought about by the same catastrophe.

La Villa Esculape. Par CAMILLE FYLLIÈRES. Paris: Téqui, Libraire-Éditeur. 1894.—This charming tale tells of an overwhelming temptation to dishonourable breach of trust, yielded to in his old age by a man previously upright and honest, but without religious principle to confirm natural virtue. The crushing sense of guilt induced by his fall becomes the harbinger of his conversion, and the complications his act had caused in the lives of others are eventually smoothed away by restitution. The narrative is animated and the plot ingeniously worked out.

Fallen Angels. By ONE OF THEM. London: Gay & Bird, 1894.—We have in this volume a serious attempt to prove the old and unprovable hypothesis of the transmigration of souls through successive incarnations. A novelty, indeed, is added in the supposi-

tion that the fallen angels may be permitted to work out their redemption by accepting the humiliation, as it would seem to their spiritual nature, of undergoing imprisonment in a human or animal body.

Outlines of the Law as to the Custody of Children, with chapters on the Law relating to Children in Reformatory and Industrial Schools. By WILLIAM CASSELL MAUDE, B.C.L., M.A., Barrister-at-Law, and DUDLEY W. B. LEATHLEY, Solicitor. Third Edition, revised and enlarged, 8vo, pp. 148. London: Burns & Oates, 1s.—We welcome the appearance of the third edition of this valuable manual upon a part of the law in which the interests of the Church in this country are so often and so vitally concerned. A preface by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster warmly commends the work, and very clearly points out its usefulness to the parochial clergy. His Eminence enforces the fact that the knowledge conveyed by it is of a kind which comes to the aid of the priest in critical moments, when the souls of children are at stake, and when such souls may be saved to the Church by promptly using it, and lost by ignoring or neglecting it. It ought to have a place in every priest's library. We looked twice to see if it were really a Catholic work, it has such an excellent index.

Books Received.

- Father John Morris.** Rev. Richard F. Clarke, S.J. London : Burns & Oates. 8vo, pp. 15.
- The Land of Heart's Desire.** W. B. Yeats. London : T. Fisher Unwin. 8vo, pp. 43.
- The Perfection of Man by Charity.** Reginald Buckler, O.P. London : Burns & Oates. Second Edition. 8vo, pp. 352.
- The Month of Mary of Our Lady of Lourdes.** Henri Laserre. Translated by Mrs. Crosier. London : Burns & Oates. New Edition. 8vo, pp. 270.
- Ethics of Benedict de Spinoza.** Translated by W. Hale White and Amelia H. Stirling. London : T. Fisher Unwin. Second Edition. 8vo, pp. 297.
- London Letters.** Geo. W. Smalley. London : Macmillan. Vol. II. 8vo, pp. 583.
- Mois de Marie.** D'après les grands Prédicateurs contemporains. Paris : Téqui. 8vo, pp. 287.
- European History, 1598-1715.** H. O. Wakeman. London : Rivington, Percival & Co. 8vo, pp. 393.
- Our Confirmation Class.** Right Rev. T. R. Wynne, Anglican Bishop of Killaloe. London : Hodder & Stoughton. Pp. 104.
- Father Faber's May Book.** By an Oblate of Mary Immaculate. London : Burns & Oates. Pp. 108.
- Fallen Angels.** By One of Them. London : Gay & Bird. 8vo, pp. 230.
- The Bells of N. D. of Bruges.** Rev. M. P. Horgan. London : Art and Book Co. Pp. 38.
- The Supernatural in Christianity.** Principal Rainey, Professor Orr, and Professor Marcus Dods. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. 8vo, pp. 110.

- Life of St. Philip Neri.** Translated by Rev. T. A. Pope, from Cardinal Capeceletro. London: Burns & Oates. 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 490-504.
- The Little Sisters of the Poor.** Mrs. Abel Ram. London: Longmans. Pp. 312.
- Barabbas.** Marie Corelli. London: Methuen. Pp. 465.
- The Beloved Disciple.** Rev. Fr. Rawes. London: Burns & Oates. Third Edition. Pp. 191.
- Science and Religion.** G. de Molinari. Paris: Guillaumin et Cie. 8vo, pp. 282.
- Archbishop Laud.** By a Romish Recusant. London: Kegan Paul & Co. Pp. 490.
- The Data of Modern Ethics Examined.** Rev. J. Ming, S.J. New York: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 386.
- The Factory System and Factory Acts.** R. W. Cooke-Taylor. London: Methuen & Co. Pp. 184.
- L'Église et le Peuple.** Edmond Preveraud. Paris: Tèqui. Pp. 416.
- Ecce Homo.** Forty Short Meditations on the Bitter Passion and Death of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Rev. D. G. Hubert. London: R. Washbourne. 12mo, pp. 196.
- Clarence Belmont, or a Lad of Honour.** Rev. Walter T. Leahy. Philadelphia: H. L. Kilner. 8vo, pp. 288.
- Steps to French.** A. M. M. Stedman, M.A. London: Methuen & Co. 8vo, pp. 79.
- Jésus Outragé, ou Le Mois des Opprobres.** R. P. Deidier. Paris: Tèqui. 8vo, pp. xxiii.-300.
- Trusts, Pools, and Corners as affecting Commerce and Industry.** J. Stephen Jeans, M.R.I., F.S.S. London: Methuen & Co. 8vo, pp. viii.-190.
- Kant et la Science Moderne,** R. P. Tilman Pesch, S.J. Traduit de l'Allemand par M. Lequien. Paris: Lethielleux. 8vo, pp. 277.
- Richard Steele.** G. A. Aitken. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 8vo, pp. lxxi.-452.

- Andrew A. Bonar, D.D.** *Diary and Letters* transcribed and edited by his daughter, Marjory Bonar. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 8vo, pp. xv.-399.
- Mediæval Records and Sonnets.** Aubrey de Vere. London: Macmillan & Co. 8vo, pp. xiii.-270.
- Sherborne, or The House of the Four Ways.** E. H. Dering (Atherstone Series). London and Leamington: Art and Book Co. 8vo, pp. 505.
- The First Divorce of Henry VIII.** Mrs. Hope. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 8vo, pp. xvii.-375.
- Curtice's Index to the Times and other Newspapers.** London: Edward Curtice. 4to, pp. 267.
- The Drama of the Apocalypse.** London: T. Fisher Unwin. 8vo, pp. 241.
- Dialectica Petri Cardinalis Pázmány.** *Quam e Codice Manuscripto Bibliothecæ Universitatis Budapestinensis recensuit* Stephanus Boynar. Budapestini. 4to, pp. xxii.-688.
- Some Aspects of Disestablishment.** *Essays by Clergymen of the Church of England.* Edited by H. C. Shuttleworth, Rector of St. Nicholas Cole Abbey. London: Innes & Co. 8vo, pp. x.-192.
- The Primitive Church and the See of Peter.** With an Introduction by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Rev. Luke Rivington, M.A. London: Longmans & Co. 8vo, pp. xxxii.-488.
- L'Ancien Clergé de France.** *Les Evêques pendant la Revolution.* L'Abbé Sicard. Paris: Victor Lecoffre. 8vo, pp. 513.
- The Formation of Christendom.** T. W. Allies, K.C.S.G. London: Burns & Oates. 8vo, pp. xii.-328.
- Manuel du Prêtre aux Etats Unis, en Anglais et Français.** Louis de Goesbriand, Evêque de Burlington. New York: Pustet. 8vo, pp. xx.-254.
- A Little Book on the Love of God.** From the French of the Rev. Father Grou by a Dominican Father. London: St. Anselm's Society. 8vo, pp. xiii.-240.

- The Ban of Maplethorpe.** With Life of the Author. E. H. Dering. London and Leamington: Art and Book Co. 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 248-242-50.
- Histoire du Second Empire.** Tome second. Pierre de la Gorce. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 8vo, pp. 258.
- The Christ has Come: The Second Advent: An Event of the Past.** E. Hampden Cook, M.A. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 8vo, pp. xii.-163.
- History of the Passion.** Rev. Arthur Devine, Passionist. London: Burns & Oates. 8vo, pp. xv.-292.
- Naguère-Aujourd'hui.** Mme la Comtesse de Beaurepaire de Louvagny. Paris: Tèqui. 8vo, pp. 428.
- Imitation of Christ.** Facsimile Reproduction of the First Edition. Thomas à Kempis. With Introduction by Canon Knox Little, M.A. London: Elliot Stock. 4to.
- Institutiones Theologicæ.** Auctore G. Bernardo Tepe, S.J. Paris: Lethielleux. 8vo, pp. 636.
- Carmina Mariana.** An English Anthology in Verse, in honour of, or in relation to, the B.V.M. Orby Shipley, M.A. London: Burns & Oates. 8vo, pp. xxxii.-461.
- Explanation of Deharbe's Small Catechism.** James Canon Schmitt, D.D. Translated from the 7th German Edition. Freiburg in Breslau: Herder. 8vo, pp. viii.-298.
- The Life and Times of James the First.** Darwin Swift, B.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 8vo, pp. xix.-509.
- The Life of Blessed Anthony Balduino.** Fr. Francis Goldie, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 8vo, pp. xi.-383.
- Souvenirs d'Auberge.** Paul Harel. Paris: Vic et Amat. 8vo, pp. 200.
- La Servante de Dieu, Marie de Sainte-Euphrasie Pelletier.** M. le Chanoine Portais. Paris: Delhomme et Briquet. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Memoirs du Chancelier Pasquier.** M. le Duc d'Audiffret-Pasquier. Première Partie. Tome troisième. Paris: Librairie Plon. 8vo, pp. 448.
- East Syrian Daily Offices.** Arthur John McClean, Dean of Argyll and the Isles. London: Rivington & Co. 8vo, pp. xxx.-304.

- A Catholic Library.** Ed. Walter J. Richards. Book of Psalms, pp. 240.—Spiritual Combat, pp. 237.—Imitation of Christ, pp. 256.—Devout Life, pp. 344.—New Testament, pp. 444.
- Pax Nobiscum.** A Manual of Prayers. London: Burns & Oates.
- Health at School.** Clement Dukes, M.D. Rivington, Percival & Co., pp. 498.
- Bernadette de Lourdes.** Emile Pouvillon. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 8vo, pp. 280.
- The Resurrection of the Dead.** The late Rev. W. Milligan, D.D. Edinburgh: T. T. Clark. 8vo, pp. 246.
- The Means of Grace.** Adapted from the German of Rev. H. Rolpes & F. J. Brändle, by Rev. R. Brennan. Illustrated. New York: Benziger. 8vo, pp. 545.
- Natal Astrology.** S. Wilde, J. Dodson. Halifax: Occult Book Co. 8vo, pp. xxviii.—216.
- Les Origines du Concordat.** Leon Séché. Paris: Ch. Delagrave, 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 378, 329.
- Code de Procédure Canonique dans les Causes Matrimoniales.** L'Abbé Périès. Paris: Lethielleux. 8vo, pp. 261.
- La foi dans la Divinité de J.C.** R. P. Didon. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 8vo, pp. 260.
- Cardinal Manning.** A. W. Hutton, M.A. London: Methuen & Co. 8vo, pp. 260.
- Divine Worship.** By Sacerdos. London: Burns & Oates. 8vo, pp. 62.
- Life of Leon Papui-Dupont** (The Holy Man of Tours). Edited by E. H. Tompson. Latest Edition. London: Burns & Oates. 8vo, pp. 447.

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1894.

ART. I.—THE EARLIEST ROMAN MASS-BOOK.

1. *The Gelasian Sacramentary: Liber Sacramentorum Romanæ Ecclesiæ.* Edited, with Introduction, Critical Notes, and Appendix, by H. A. WILSON, M.A., Fellow of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford. At the Clarendon Press. 1894.
2. *Ueber das sogenannte Sacramentarium Gelasianum.* Von P. SUITBERT BÄUMER, O.S.B. (Reprinted from the *Historisches Jahrbuch*, vol. xiv. 1893, pp. 241–301). München: J. G. Weiss. 1893.

SELF-COMPLACENCY is a most happy endowment in this world. Not long ago a writer in the great Anglican quarterly, taking his stand on the vantage-ground of the Book of Common Prayer, compiled and first printed in 1548 and 1549, looked down with something of pitying patronage on that more modern work, the Roman Missal of St. Pius V., which only issued from the press some twenty years later. Of course this is ridiculous, but in the present rarified state of the atmosphere in high Anglican circles, it may be credited that the writer spoke in simplicity of good faith according to his sense and feeling. For the most part Catholics are content, where the sacred liturgy is concerned, to take in an even, not to say indifferent, spirit the good that comes to them without inquiring too particularly how it came. They are content in a general way with the fact that they are in the full current and

stream of an uninterrupted tradition, the source of which is to be found in the apostolic age itself. Still it should be even for Catholics a subject of interest to ascertain in some measure the steps by which the mass-book in use to-day came to be what it is; and to trace the gradual accretions that have gathered round the primitive kernel. Although there is no reason to despair of the substantial accomplishment of this task some day, the process must be slow and painful, for few subjects of investigation are more obscure than the origins of the Christian liturgy, and the steps whereby various types of divine service were developed in different churches; few subjects afford such wide scope for free conjecture or arbitrary assertion. The rule is general that no contemporary record was made, public or private, marking the chief steps or phases of the evolution. At most, traditional names—St. Basil or St. Chrysostom, St. Gelasius, or St. Gregory—have become attached to special mass-books or liturgies; even more vaguely still, an apostolic attribution, for instance, St. James, St. Mark, serves to point out the church in which the liturgy so named was in use. The case of the Roman rite differs from the rest only so far that the ancient extant materials are more abundant, and that in the case of this rite, beyond any other, serious and more or less critical attempts have been made to recover a lost history. Moreover, though no Church showed itself more solicitous in what, for want of a better term, we may call patristic times, to guard its own rite from foreign admixture, the earliest extant books and detailed accounts of the rite are due to the curiosity or the zeal with which aliens were led to inquire into its specific features, or to propagate its forms and texts in their own land.

Three early missal-books of the Roman Church, or, as they were called, sacramentaries (books of the sacraments, of the divine mysteries), are extant, now usually called the Leonine, Gelasian, and Gregorian. Whatever discussion may arise as to the exact propriety of the names which thus pass current, they have at least the merit and advantage of clearly indicating three successive stages of development, and substantially corresponding (with what justice may be here left an open question) to the second half of the fifth century, and the beginning of the sixth and seventh. It must not be supposed

that these mass-books present, on opening, just the same appearance as a missal of the present day. They comprise only what was then said by the celebrant himself: collects, secrets, post-communions, prefaces, the canon. The epistles and gospels, and all the sung portions of the mass, were to be found in separate books, and formed no part of the Missal itself. On the other hand the Ritual and the Pontifical had then no existence; and the whole of the functions of bishop and priest, baptism, ordination, the special rites of Holy Week and Pentecost, were in those centuries comprised in the Book of the Sacraments, or Missal.

The earliest of these Roman sacramentaries, the so-called Leonine, has no claim to be a formal mass-book. It is indeed ranged according to months, but it shows hardly so much outline of order in its contents as even this would imply. The collection is ample, two, three, a dozen or even more masses being given for the same feast; but it can evidently pretend to be no more than a body of materials brought together by a private hand.

The second, what has been called the Gelasian Sacramentary, presents quite another character. It is an ordered collection in the form of three books. Speaking from the bulk of the contents of each book, the first contains the missal and other offices connected with the ecclesiastical year; the second, masses for saints' days. The third book presents a large body of votive masses, with a certain number for Sundays and week-days. As yet a special mass had not been assigned to each Sunday after Epiphany and Pentecost; these Sunday masses were therefore a collection from which the celebrant could, during those seasons, select at discretion. The title expressly describes the volume as the "Book of the Sacraments of the Roman Church."

In the last, the Gregorian Sacramentary, in the earliest and purest form in which it occurs, the whole is comprised in a single book; the saints' days are no longer treated as outside the ecclesiastical year, but are ranged as an integral part of it; the collection of masses for Sundays and week-days and the votive masses have disappeared. In the Gelasian there are, as a rule, two collects for each mass (though sometimes three, and sometimes, especially for saints' days, only one); in the Gre-

gorian the rule is a single collect. The special prefaces and variants of the canon, very numerous in the Gelasian, are, with one or two exceptions, those of our present missal. Many traces of an early age, visible in the Gelasian book, and many ritual elaborations, have been swept away. The powerful hand of a reformer has passed over the Roman rite, reducing it to a simplicity which seems baldness in comparison with the earlier superabounding wealth of forms shown in the Leonine and Gelasian books.

It was in this form that Pope Hadrian I., some time between the years 784 and 791, sent to Charles the Great the sacramentary "arranged long ago by our holy predecessor the God-inspired (*Deifluo*) Gregory," as the Pope says in the letter announcing its despatch. But this book was not destined long to remain in the state in which it came from Rome; an addition was soon made to it trebling its bulk, and making it considerably larger indeed than the *Gelasianum*. The compiler of this supplement was careful to insert between the original book and his own compilation a preface giving an account of his work and of his reasons for undertaking it. This preface, as was natural in the case of a mass-book designed for practical use, and not for the satisfaction of literary or antiquarian curiosity, soon fell out of the sacramentary; the two portions continued separate and unmixed for a time, longer here, shorter there, according to the character or ideas of the individual copyist, or of those who directed him. By-and-by, as was inevitable, practical requirements felt by all prevailed over a literary or pious scruple, and the various items of the supplement were inserted at the most convenient places in the original book. Though in an isolated later manuscript a trace of the primitive distinction may still be found, the true *Gregorianum* and the supplement were, by the close of the tenth century, so fused into one whole, that it was impossible to distinguish any longer the component parts of what now passed as the Gregorian Sacramentary. And it is the book thus fused which, practically speaking, forms the Roman missal of the present day.

Unfortunately few liturgists of later times have been careful to observe the distinction between the original book and the additions, and nearly all writers have used the term "Gre-

gorian Sacramentary" to designate, not the book sent to Charles from Rome, but the whole compilation as afterwards enlarged. Now, however, that M. Duchesne has introduced the convenient term *sacramentaire d'Hadrien* for the book sent by that Pope to Charles, it is not likely that the term "Gregorian Sacramentary" will in future be so improperly employed as has been hitherto the case. But a further point is also gained, for it is now possible to enter into the discussion of a much more difficult question, the justice and applicability of the title "Gelasian" and "Gregorian" given to the sacramentaries which pass under these names, and that, not merely as regards the specific question whether they were personally compiled by, or by order of, Gelasius and Gregory, but also whether the missals so called are substantially Roman missals of a date that may be reasonably assigned to the beginning of the sixth century and the beginning of the seventh respectively.

And first to take the sacramentary passing under the name of Gregory. The question was raised early in the last century, but with inadequate knowledge of the evidence, whether the *Gregorianum* is not to be attributed rather to Pope Gregory II. (715-731), or Gregory III. (731-741), than to Gregory the Great. Although it is true, as the last editor of the *Gelasianum* points out,* that neither St. Bede nor the *Liber pontificalis* mentions the work, yet this is only a half light, since Bede's disciple, Archbishop Egbert of York (732-766) not merely says that St. Gregory sent his missal book to England by St. Augustine, but that he himself had also inspected this same work of St. Gregory in Rome; moreover, at least half a century earlier, Aldhelm, in referring the canon of the mass to St. Gregory (whose own, as a composition, it certainly was not), gives us clearly enough to understand that the missal he was familiar with came to him as St. Gregory's. Whether the Gregorian mass-book thus known to Egbert and Aldhelm was that which bore this title in Rome about 790, and was sent by Hadrian to Charles the Great, need not here be considered. It is for the present purpose enough to ascertain, on the authority of evidence unknown to the first writer to start the doubt,

* P. lx., note.

that the Gregory to whom the missal was attributed must be Gregory the Great.

By a general acquiescence of the learned, rather than by consent after any specific and recent critical investigation, the *Gelasianum* is commonly allowed to pass, either as an actual production of Pope Gelasius I. (492–496), or at least as dating from about his time. The recent work of Abbé Duchesne, entitled *Origines du culte Chrétien*, has, however, definitely raised the question whether the sacramentary passing under the name “Gelasian,” though incontestably in substance a Roman missal, and the earliest official mass-book of the Roman Church, has yet any right to be considered as the sixth century mass-book of that church. The manuscript itself (which, following Mr. Wilson, it will be convenient to call, from its present resting-place, the Vatican manuscript), by consent of competent palæographers, was written in the seventh century or at the beginning of the eighth, seemingly for the abbey of St. Denis. Examining the manuscript as it stands, Duchesne finds that it does not contain the masses for Thursdays in Lent instituted by Pope Gregory II. (715–731); but it has the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, which was doubtless, he thinks, introduced after the recovery of the true Cross by Heraclius in 628. “There is, therefore, an uncertainty of about a century (628–731) as to the date of the Roman original of our sacramentary.” He concludes generally that “it is drawn from official books that were in use at Rome about the end of the seventh century,” and that it “was imported into France some considerable time before Pope Hadrian (772), and some considerable time after St. Gregory” (604). On the other hand the author points out how Roman features have been obliterated from this book: “all Roman topographical indications have disappeared; not one of the Roman basilicas is mentioned.* All prayers relating to certain offices proper to Roman observance, the mass of St. Anastasia on Christmas Day, the Greater Litany (April 25), the processions of the Easter vespers, the collectæ or assemblies at certain feasts have

* For the force of this remark it is enough to refer to the missal now in general use, and the Roman stations therein regularly noted.

been suppressed. It presents the Roman ecclesiastical year, Roman formulæ, but adapted to the use of countries at a distance from Rome." This is not all; it is also marked by numerous Gallican additions and modifications; and such additions are not by way of mere appended supplement, but are woven into the very texture of the book.

The sum, therefore, is this: That the book called the *Gelasianum* represents the (or a) mass-book in use in Rome towards the close of the seventh century. This conclusion is based on the assumption that certain feasts or days now found in the Vatican manuscript must have stood in the Roman original from which that manuscript was derived. The question whether it stands removed by one or more stages from the Roman original, "model or framework rather," and whether it may not be at the least a copy of a copy with many an intermediate alteration derived not merely from Gallican but also from later Roman sources, does not suggest itself in the author's pages; although the effacement of Roman features, and the interweaving of Gallicanisms in the Roman groundwork, are not calculated *prima facie* to recommend the assumption of a direct Roman original.

Of course if there be good reason, drawn from other considerations (of positive testimony there is none), for supposing that a missal of the type represented by the *Gelasianum* was in actual use in Rome at the end of the seventh century, there is less cause to seek for any other explanation of the presence of these feasts of late introduction than the simple one of a direct copy. But for the fact of such use I see no other argument than lies in the positive affirmation. Unquestionably such an assertion on the part of a scholar of M. Duchesne's eminence and proved capacity is sufficient ground for meeting it, not indeed with the mere silence of acquiescence, but with a full consideration and examination of the case conducted with a prepossession in its favour; and not rejecting it until difficulties occur of sufficient force to raise a well-founded doubt whether the author himself has realised all that this assertion on this single point involves of contradiction to the current history of the time.

And first of all, if the *Gelasianum* be a sacramentary in use in Rome at the close of the seventh century, what are we to

think of the *Gregorianum*? M. Duchesne, in another connection, answers the question thus: "It is essentially a book for the stations," in other words, "for use only on festival days or days of solemn assembly"; "it is the Pope's book, it contains the prayers which the Pope has to pronounce at the ceremonies over which he ordinarily presides." The proof for this is, that it gives masses only for feasts, or seasons like Lent and Advent; no masses for ordinary Sundays, no votive masses; nothing for weddings or funerals, or the veiling of virgins, or reconciliation of penitents. Accustomed as we are, and so long have been, to many of these luxuries, this may appear conclusive; but, strange as it may sound to some ears, there is a question to the point which demands an answer:—Why must all these things be found in a Roman missal (say) of the time of St. Gregory the Great? Why, for instance, should St. Gregory deem special masses for these "private solemnities," for rain or fair weather, or Sundays after Pentecost, more necessary than the Greeks do at this day or at any time during the last fifteen hundred years?

Gathering up the indications thrown out by M. Duchesne, we are given to understand that there were in use in Rome at the close of the seventh century two missals, differing widely in their contents, in the character and degree of their variables, in the number of collects at mass, and in the prayers not only of each mass, but also for the sacraments: a smaller missal for the Pope, a much larger book for the rest of the clergy. And here questions arise which demand notice, if not solution, before the novel theory thus broached can be well admitted, questions, however, not in any way touched on by the author. And they are the more urgent inasmuch as they do not proceed from a mere comparison of book and book, or confronting of text and text, written under circumstances of which we know hardly anything by persons of whom we can know still less; but are concerned with the public policy of a great prince like Charlemagne, whose individual attention was largely devoted to what may be called the Department of Public Worship and Instruction; and who, in carrying out a measure in which he was by inclination deeply interested, viz., the introduction of the Roman mass-book throughout his realm, may be presumed to have acted in accordance with

the dictates of sound reason, and in a manner calculated to secure the objects he had in view. Moreover, it is to be noted that Charlemagne, no less than his advisers, was perfectly well acquainted from personal observation with the actual liturgy and observance in Rome. We are naturally led therefore to inquire what at this time (the second half of the eighth century) can have been the position of the *Gelasianum*, said to have been the mass-book of the clergy at the close of the seventh century. If it was still in Charles's day the clergy's mass-book, how came Charles, in the intent to secure uniformity and conformity with Roman practice, to adopt for the use of the clergy throughout his dominions a book not in common use in Rome itself, but proper only for the Pope, adding, moreover, a new supplement unknown in Rome? If, on the other hand, the *Gelasianum* had now fallen into disuse in Rome, and was superseded by the imposition for general use of the imperfect papal mass-book, supplemented by additional offices, Sunday and votive masses, &c., required for ordinary use by the clergy in the parish churches, the action taken is still more inexplicable. We are reduced to conclude that Hadrian failed to send to Charles the supplement to the Gregorian mass-book in use in Rome by the clergy, and Charles in his turn (though constantly sending trusty envoys to the Pope, whose interest it was to comply with his behest, and especially with a demand so little burdensome) failed to ask for that supplement. Or, indeed, is it that the novel theory of the use at the same time in Rome of two different missals has no historical basis, and is no more than a deduction from liturgical texts capable of another explanation, and a deduction also running counter to, and making merely unintelligible, the actions and measures of Charlemagne?

It must be some considerations of this kind which, in penning his article on the *Gelasianum*, prompted Dom Suitbert Bäumer, a monk of Beuron, to write as follows: -

Duchesne's way of treating the subject is new and interesting, but also (in some measure) not to the point; this freshness is attractive, and the respect felt for the talent and learning of the author makes most welcome the light which the reader cannot but hope will be thereby thrown on the subject. When, however, an attempt is made to bring the suggestions

and remarks, scattered here and there, into harmony with the fundamental conditions of the problem that has to be discussed, the reader soon begins to feel that, although Duchesne's text reads easily, yet on examination it is difficult to bring into consistency with ascertained facts the new theory which is rather sketched or shadowed out than developed, much less established. Hence the necessity of finding some other way out of the difficulty at one's own risk and peril.

In the following pages Dom Bäumer's article is drawn on without scruple as a serious attempt to grapple with the difficulties involved in the history of the *Gelasianum*, without knowledge of which it is impossible to form an opinion as to the value of the contribution made to the subject by the Rev. H. A. Wilson's edition recently issued from the Clarendon Press. And, what is of much more general interest, in the history of this *Gelasianum* lies the history of the missal in actual daily use in our churches.

It is to be observed that Duchesne restricts his inquiry to very narrow limits, hardly going beyond the four corners of the book the age of which is to be investigated. But such partial method is not likely to lead to solid and satisfactory results. It is necessary to take a view of the whole of the facts bearing on the subject, and to see what is known, or can be reasonably deduced from authentic documents as to the history and fortunes of this book—a side of the question which, it may be said, has been hitherto almost entirely neglected.

Dom Bäumer gives first an exposition of the facts that can be positively known, proceeding to what must be conjecture and combination only after the conditions of the problem to be solved are distinctly ascertained.

We start with the certain fact of the existence of a sacramentary which, in writers of the first half of the ninth century in France, was commonly known under the name of the "Gelasian." Whether they were right or wrong in so designating the sacramentary, one point at any rate is certain from the very name they gave it—viz., their belief that it was of Roman origin and dated from a time anterior to the ordering of the missal then in use in Rome, attributed to St. Gregory the Great. And here it is well at the commencement to bear in mind a suggestion of common

sense which, in the work of minute critical examination or handling of mere texts, seems only too readily and too commonly forgotten—namely, that if the sacramentary called “Gelasian” had any considerable circulation in the country in which it is so frequently spoken of, that is, the Frankish Empire (in Rome it is not mentioned until a later date), it is in the last degree improbable that the oldest manuscripts now existing were the most ancient then to be found; or to put the case more definitely, it is only reasonable to suppose that, at a time when it was still a living rite, those who first spoke of the *Gelasianum* had in hand manuscripts (perhaps many) older (perhaps much older) than any which have survived not merely the disuse of the rite, but the neglect and innumerable accidents of more than a thousand years.

Was, however, this so-called Gelasian mass-book largely used and widely spread in Gaul? This is a question which Dom Bäumer has been the first to consider in all its bearings; and on the answer to it the whole history of present liturgical practice hinges. On the theories current on the subject, which assume the practical universality of the Gallican rite in Charles’s kingdom in the middle of the eighth century, it has long been a puzzle to read, in an inventory of the church stuff and library of the Abbey of St. Riquier, near Abbeville, dated 831,* that the monastery was provided for church use with nineteen “Gelasian missals,” whilst there were, besides, only three “Gregorian,” and one “Gregorian and Gelasian missal recently arranged by Albinus” (that is, Alcuin). And this is the more singular since the abbot, by whose care the monastery was practically refounded, enriched with ornaments, and furnished with a large collection of books, was Angilbert, son-in-law, friend, counsellor, and minister of Charles, and intimately mixed up in the measures, secular and especially religious, of that great and autocratic ruler. In a now lost library catalogue of Cologne of the year 833, there was mention of a Gelasian missal; two others are found more than a century later in the library of Lorsch, near Worms. But it is not merely in the libraries of

* The list of books is, doubtless, like that of church stuff, in the main a repetition of one taken in the first years of the century. Unfortunately, Angilbert’s own list of that date, whilst detailed as to church stuff, only gives the number of the books.

monasteries or cathedrals that there is evidence of its use; it is also found in obscure country villages. The inventories of half a dozen such churches in the diocese of Rheims, taken about the year 850, still exist. Of these six churches, three have only a "Gregorian" missal; two possess both a "Gregorian" and a "Gelasian" book;* in the sixth the Gelasian book alone was in use. It is to be remembered that of the documents most proper to reveal to us the actual state of things in this matter—inventories—not more than fifteen now exist, dating from the ninth century, out of hundreds, or more probably many thousands, actually taken; whilst the somewhat less rare library catalogues are generally sparing in distinguishing the kinds of missals they more often mention than particularly describe. It is worthy of notice also that in the extant lists, whether of churches or libraries, there is not a single mention of a book to be plausibly identified with a "Gallican" missal. Account must also be taken of manuscripts, which (as will be seen later) must certainly belong to the class of missals called in the inventories Gelasian. The oldest, the Vatican MS., first published by Tomasi, and now re-edited by Mr. Wilson, was of Paris; another seems to come from the "north of France;"† another apparently from the eastern districts of the present Switzerland. Of manuscripts less well known, but without doubt falling into this pre-Gregorian class, one occurs at Gelone, or St. Guillem du Désert, near Aniane, north-west of Montpellier, others at Angoulême, and probably at Reichenau on the lake of Constance.‡ There is therefore documentary evidence of the existence, previous to the ninth century, and in an earlier or later form, of the book designated "Gelasian" along the whole north and eastern portions of Charlemagne's Frankish kingdom; and also traces, though much fewer and less marked, in those south-western districts comprising the kingdom of Aquitaine.

An item in the inventory of St. Riquier now calls for atten-

* There can be no doubt that the "missale cum evangeliis et lectionibus" at Vieil-St.-Remy was a Gregorian book.

† The Martyrology in the same volume, on which this conclusion is based, seems to point to the district of the present Belgian provinces of Hainaut and Namur; and with this the Irish indications also well accord.

‡ Mone's manuscripts of "shortened Gregorian" books evidently belong to the Gelasian class (*Lateinische und Griechische Messen*, p. 122 seqq.) In Addit. MS. 29,276 is a Gelasian scrap of the eighth century.

tion, the "Gregorian and Gelasian missal recently arranged by Alcuin." Alcuin had not merely been, as abbot of St. Josse-sur-Mer, a neighbour (somewhat of an absentee neighbour doubtless) of the monastery of St. Riquier, but his letters also show that he was a friend and intimate of the house, and that he had been engaged for the monks in revising, in accordance with the more correct taste of the time, the barbarous style of the old life of their founder, St. Richarius; so that we can be under no temptation to think that when the monks of St. Riquier attributed to Alcuin (an old and close friend also of their own abbot Angilbert) the compilation of a missal in their own possession, they were speaking on mere report or otherwise than by real and personal knowledge of the facts.* What, then, is this Gelasiano-Gregorian compilation for which Alcuin is responsible? Here it is well to adopt Dom Bäumer's own words:

The Gregorian sacramentary has not come down to us without change in just the form in which it was sent by Hadrian to Charles. All known manuscripts show an edition of the Gregorianum largely augmented from other sources. All "Gregorian" books, whether they bear Gregory's name on the title, or whether they are merely designated as "Roman," amidst infinite variety in minor details, show practically the same body of texts and order of prayers. In a word, one and only one edition of Pope Hadrian's Gregorianum now exists—an edition enriched with additional matter and adapted to usages widely spread in the Frankish kingdom; and in this form only was the Gregorianum naturalised among the Frankish clergy and people.

It has already been pointed out that this enlarged Gregorian sacramentary exists in manuscripts which for the present purpose may be divided into three classes: (1) Those in which the additional matter is kept distinct and separate from the original matter by a preface, and frequently a detailed list of the additions; (2) manuscripts in which, though the original matter and the additions are still kept separate, yet the preface and list of chapters, which in the former class draw so clear and unmistakable line of division, have disappeared; (3) the largest and ever-increasing class, in which the sacramentary sent by Pope Hadrian is fused with the additions so as to form an

* It is not at all improbable that the book list comes from the very hand of Angilbert, a special affection for whom Alcuin's letters so abundantly testify.

indivisible whole which it is no longer possible to resolve into its constituent elements.

The preface, therefore, in which the compiler of the supplement gives an account of his work and of the reasons for it, is a document which *primâ facie* has the strongest claims to an attentive hearing; the more so inasmuch as it is a case of the rarest occurrence to find an actual account by the author himself of a liturgical compilation. A Quignon, a Robinet, has let us into his confidence; Cranmer has explained the leading ideas which led him to substitute the Book of Common Prayer for the missal. But these are, after all, matters of quite sectional interest compared with the constitution of this Carolingian mass-book, which, a comparatively short time after its appearance, became, and has to this day continued, the great official prayer-book of the whole Western Church. The fate of the preface, and its neglect by the learned, has been singular. In all the early manuscripts it is anonymous; but when first printed, in 1571, the editor, Pamelius, on the authority of a single manuscript of a date so late as the eleventh century, attached to it the name of a personage who died nearly a century after the introduction of the *Gregorianum* into France.* Dom Ménard was the first, some seventy years later, to examine it with attention; and he could find no better course than to reject it as "absurd," because it ran counter to certain not unnatural prejudices as to what a Roman mass-book of the eighth century ought to be. Ernst Ranke was the first to restore the credit of the preface by taking it seriously, and was rewarded for his pains by many a valuable hint. Duchesne has somewhat too hastily thrown over the preface entirely to the care of a future historian of the *Gregorianum*. To Dr. Probst it is difficulty and darkness. It is singular that centuries have been allowed to pass, and that still a full examination of this document should have been omitted. But here, as in the case of many another episode of liturgical history, the tendency among persons engaged in these inquiries is only too marked to take up a position in some

* The book of Pamelius still remains the only one which shows the preface in its proper place in the sacramentary; and even his print gives names not warranted by the manuscripts. It seems unnecessary to burden the discussion any further with the names of Rodradus and Grimoldus, which may be considered as disposed of.

corner of ritual research, to the neglect of the wise warning of one who spoke with the knowledge that comes from experience: "We must penetrate into history if, in the subject of liturgy, we are to arrive at clearness, fixity, certainty, in our conclusions."

Let us then see what the compiler, to whom we owe our present Missal, and much else in the Pontifical and Ritual, has to say for himself. It is this. "The foregoing sacramentary (*sacramentorum libellus*) up to this point is known to have been put forth (*constat esse editus*) by the Blessed Pope Gregory, except those items which the reader will find marked at the beginning with a dagger (*virgula*), the Nativity and Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, but chiefly in Lent"; also the mass of St. Gregory. Moreover, by the carelessness of scribes, the text had become corrupt, so that the book (*libellus*) was no longer in the state in which it had left St. Gregory's hands (*ut ab auctore suo est editus*). This defect, he says, he has made good, and corrected; and he appeals with considerable confidence to his work as proof that he had restored the original and true reading (*quem cum prudens lector studiose perlegerit verum nos dicere ilico comprobabit*). First of all, then, it is clear that the writer had submitted the sacramentary sent from Rome to a critical examination; that (although this was unnecessary for practical purposes) his scholarly instincts, combined perhaps with a veneration for the great St. Gregory, induced him, without moving them from their proper place in the book, to distinguish by a mark later additions from the work of Gregory himself; moreover, he restored the text to what he felt assured was its original purity. The writer does not here state in so many words that he used earlier manuscripts to correct the current Roman edition; but in view of the terms he uses, of the delicate circumstances attending the correction of a liturgical book proceeding from such an "author," of his care to mark later insertions (and those who are best acquainted with the uncertainty attending the date of the introduction of new feasts into particular churches will best estimate the difficulty of that task), it is not unreasonable to suppose that the revision was conducted on the lines of collation with older manuscripts, and that the reviser had means within his reach for such collation. These processes were perfectly well known at the time; and

the value of older or good manuscripts was perfectly well appreciated.

After describing his work on the Gregorian sacramentary, the writer proceeds to give an account of the supplement added by himself:

But since there are other materials which Holy Church necessarily (*necessario*) uses, and which the aforesaid Father [Gregory] left aside (*praetermisit*), seeing that they had been already put forth by others, we have thought it worth while to gather them like spring flowers of the meadows, and collect them together, and place them in this book apart, but corrected and amended and headed with their titles, so that the reader may find in this work all things which we have thought necessary for our times, although we had found a great many also embodied in other sacramentaries (*sacramentorum libellis*).^{*} But for the purpose of separation we have placed this little preface in the middle, so that it may form the close of one book [Gregory's] and the beginning of the other [his own]; to the intent that, one book being before the preface and the other after it [*hinc inde formabiliter eisdem positis libellis*], every one may know what was put forth by Blessed Gregory and what by other Fathers. . . . Let the reader be assured that we have inserted nothing but what has been written with great accuracy and care by men of excellent learning and the highest repute (*nisi ea quae a probatissimis et eruditissimis magna diligentia exarata sunt viris*).

After stating that he had given a collection of special mass prefaces at the end of the book, he continues: "We also add the benedictions to be said by the bishop over the people; also, what is not to be found in the aforesaid book of Blessed Gregory, ordination forms for minor orders."

The materials, therefore, for this supplement, *ex multis multa*, as he says, were gathered by the writer from other missals, but he took the pains to give as correct a text as possible. A certain embarrassment of tone is observable as soon as he comes to speak of this his own work; as, indeed, it was a strong measure to add for official liturgical use an

^{*} The recent editor is of opinion that, if there had been a general belief that the main body of the "Gelasian" sacramentary was really due to St. Gelasius, the compiler of the supplement would not have refrained from citing the authority of St. Gelasius for the forms which he transferred from the older sacramentaries to his own compilation (p. lxi.). In view of the mixed character of the supplement (which the compiler doubtless recognised more completely than we can do), the expectation of a special mention of Gelasius savours of the unreason of the over-scrupulous critic. As we open the book the very first documents which meet the eye are pieces which could not be "Gelasian," or indeed Roman at all, but are drawn from Gallican sources.

appendix of prayers, selected on individual judgment, to a sacramentary believed to be the actual work of one at that time so greatly venerated as Gregory the Great, and an appendix, too, of about twice the length of Gregory's whole book. The suggestion that St. Gregory omitted the offices given in the appendix "because he saw that they had been already put forth by others," will not bear examination. And, indeed, the writer passes on quickly from St. Gregory's intentions to others with which he must have been much better acquainted, his own. "We" saw that these additions were "necessary for our times," he says; he also says it is true that "holy Church necessarily uses them," but goes on to explain, as we shall see, that by this latter "necessity" he only means, "if you are bent on using these forms you may, but there is no necessity in the sense of need, for St. Gregory's *libellus* is a sufficient missal without my additions."

This is how he develops his own intentions in compiling the supplement:

And as we thought it was not at all decent or possible to pay no regard to the wishes of those who look to find these so excellent and varied holy observances (*et quoniam excludendos tantarum quaesitores variarumque institutionum sanctarum nequaquam dignum vel possibile esse censuimus*), we would at any rate satisfy the most worthy desires of all these persons by the present abundant collection. If it please any one to accept what, without any desire of imposing ourselves on others (*sine fastu arrogantiae*), we have collected with pious affection and the greatest care, we beg him not to be of mind ungrateful for our toil, but with us to render thanks to the Giver of all good things. But if he consider our collection a superfluity and not necessary for himself, let him use the work of the aforesaid Father alone, which in not a tittle may he reject without peril to himself; and let him also tolerate those who demand [our supplement] and wish piously to use it. For, not for the thankless and the scornful, but for the zealous and the devout have we brought together this collection in which he to whom these prayers are dear and familiar (*cui animo sedent*) may find whence he may worthily and with a mind unruffled* pay to our Lord his due vows, and perform the service of divine worship. . . . Moreover, we entreat those to whom they are acceptable, to receive with charity the collection of prefaces added at the end of the volume, and sing them; but we beg

* *Placabiliter*. It may be said "in a way pleasing to God" would be more exact; but, even so, the idea would, after all, be no other than that given in the text. Persons who recall the circumstances issuing in the establishment of the Romano-Lyonese use will be well able to enter into the sense of *placabiliter* here.

they be neither adopted nor sung by those who, understanding them do not like them, or who willing to receive them do not understand them.”*

The writer ends by asking copyists of his volume to pray for him who had taken so much care for the benefit of many, and—a last request—“pray copy correctly, or else my diligent emendation will have been in vain.”

What is the value of this document, what is its real meaning, and what is its authorship? The author, though he has been careful to suppress his name, and to give no direct indication of his rank and position, and has only shown that he was at all events a scholar, must have been a person of the highest consideration. For this the facts themselves speak. In this recension, and in this recension only, was the Gregorian sacramentary adopted, in accordance with the will of Charles the Great, throughout his empire. This recension spread immediately, and at some period, which may perhaps never be ascertainable, though doubtless during the course of the ninth century it was adopted by the Roman Church, thus explaining the existence of so many Gallican features in the present Roman rite. Humble as is the tone, and simple as are the words of the compiler, there can be nothing less than supreme power in the background. No work of private venture, dependent for adoption on the mere appreciation or taste of individuals could, in those days of parchment and written books, have obtained within a few decades so universal and so exclusive a recognition. It was an official undertaking, and it is hardly too much to call the preface *Hucusque* a State paper of the time.

To understand the full force and value of the document it is necessary to scan its words closely, and note the meaning that underlies its smooth and apologetic phrases. (1) It appears that the use of the *Gregorianum* was not to be optional; whatever else was used, or not used, the book sent by Hadrian to Charles must be. On this point a note is struck quite out of accord with the tenor of the rest of the document; here for a moment the veil is lifted, and the force behind is seen—“reject it at your peril.” This was to be the

* Cf. “Quamvis enim melius sit bene facere quam nosse, prius tamen est nosse quam facere.” So Charles, in his circular letter, *De litteris colendis*, issued between 780 and 800.

book of the future at any rate. (2) However the writer, in freeing himself from consideration of the *Gregorianum* and passing on to his own work, may have found it convenient to speak of the offices in his supplement being "necessarily" used in the Church, the sequel makes it perfectly clear that the use of the supplement was to be considered optional, and according to the discretion of the individual, and the *libellus* of the Blessed Pope Gregory is contemplated as a mass-book complete in itself, and containing all that was needful. (3) The writer leaves us in no doubt as to the reasons for the compilation and its object. Habit and tradition had rooted in the minds and hearts of the clergy these masses and solemn observances which he had gathered so amply from other sacramentaries; the compiler knew this as a fact, *animo edent*, and the extraordinary success which has attended his work is the best proof that his words are true, and that the "seekers" after these "so excellent and varied holy observances" were a powerful majority.

And who was the compiler? It is evident from the circumstances of the case that it can be no one else than a man in direct relation with governing circles, in other words in the confidence of Charlemagne himself. Moreover, only to a scholar of the first rank would he entrust a task vastly more important than the compilation of the book of homilies which he assigned to Paul Warnefrid, a man only second in eminence to Alcuin. Only two or three men can suggest themselves as fit instruments for such a task, which was hardly less important than the revision of the Biblical text itself. And no name occurs more readily or more reasonably to the mind than that of Alcuin. If earlier and better manuscripts were required, who so likely to be acquainted with these as the former head of the school at York—whence, a few years later, he drew manuscripts to aid him in his revision of the Bible, who well knew, too, the richly-stored and, as yet, intact English libraries largely gathered from Rome and Italy in the course of the seventh century. Moreover, a spirit makes itself felt in the preface characteristic of the Alcuin who reveals himself in his correspondence, betraying an almost nervous anxiety to be beforehand with friction, to lessen risk of conflict. When it is found, moreover, on contemporary

testimony above suspicion, that Alcuin in fact carried out such a work as a combination of the Gregorian and Gelasian, the newer and older Roman sacramentaries, little doubt can remain as to the answer to the question, who is the author of the preface *Hucusque*, and who is the compiler of the supplement attached to the *Gregorianum* sent by Pope Hadrian I. to Charles the Great.* Just as, later, Alcuin was chosen by Charles to carry out a correction of the Bible which was meant to issue in the disuse of the ancient versions and in a certain uniformity of the copies of the sacred text in future, so too the same scholar was chosen by Charles for the task of preparing a corrected text of the mass-book in use in Rome, to be imposed for the purpose of securing a greater liturgical uniformity and conformity with actual Roman practice throughout his dominions, and with the further task of facilitating the adoption of the new mass-book by the addition of a supplement, giving a selection of older materials, for the most part Roman, which had fallen into disuse in Rome, but had maintained themselves in the realm of the Franks, modified indeed and fused with Gallican elements. The words of M. Samuel Berger in describing Alcuin's work on the Bible may be fitly adapted to the present case. A Visigoth such as Theodulph of Orleans, independent in mind and character, and son of a land which had for centuries been separated from the rest of Gaul, must remain a stranger in the empire of Charlemagne. The discipline and perseverance (it may be added, the practical sense) of an Anglo-Saxon, such as Alcuin, could better serve the powerful will and clear thought of such a prince as Charles the Great. In liturgy, after Alcuin, all is changed; a levelling hand has passed over the particularism that before prevailed; liturgical texts assume a more uniform

* As to Alcuin's personal opinion on the desirability of new liturgical compilations, as such, his letter to Archbishop Eanbald of York is explicit enough. Eanbald's desire for a newly arranged missal may have been not improbably prompted by what was taking place under the direction of Charlemagne. "Have you not," he says, "an abundance of *libelli sacrorum* arranged in the Roman fashion? You have also enough larger sacramentaries of the older use. What need is there to draw up new when the old suffice?" (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. p. 508.) But Alcuin, with all his qualities, had, like Erasmus, a strong sense of the value of powerful and paying patronage. It was not an Alcuin who would directly thwart the will of Charles the Great in a matter such as this. The passage is also interesting as showing the existence at York of both Gelasian and Gregorian books at this time.

tenor, their colour is less varied and local. The older liturgies have almost everywhere been put out of use, and the copies of the missal become uniform, under reserve of course of very numerous variations of detail and continual minor alterations. But at least this result was achieved; since Alcuin, the only missal in use is the Gelasiano-Gregorian compilation. The older liturgies, the pure Roman, the Gallican, and at length the Mozarabic disappear, to give place to a common and universally accepted rite based as its main factor on Roman observance. And that is what Charlemagne had willed should be. In a word, it is the Englishman Alcuin who has been the instrument to settle the structure and tenor henceforth of the liturgy of the Western Church.

The interest of the discussion is, however, deeper than such as may concern a mere personal question; nor for Catholics, indeed, is it the disinterment of the mere fossils of a buried past. In this London of the present day we are still "Gelasian," "Gregorian," "Gallican," though it may be unawares. At the Oratory on Holy Saturday, we may still hear the lessons "according to Gelasius"; at Haverstock Hill, "according to Gregory"; and at both a blessing of the paschal candle, which neither in word nor deed is any part of the genuine Roman rite at all, but an importation of the most popular Gallican form. These existent anomalies lead us back to what is the turning point in the development of Western liturgy. The considerations which have been dwelt on enable us at last to realise the import of those frequent notices of the existence of the "Gelasian" missal which meet us through the whole region from the shores of the Northern sea along the German frontier up to the borders of north-eastern Italy, and to form some adequate idea of the prevalence in the Frankish kingdom of this earlier type of Roman missal. Only one interpretation can be put on plain and patent facts. On the one hand, stands Charles's desire for uniformity, by means of a greater conformity with the practice of the Apostolic See, in observance, in song, in rites, as part of a policy long and steadily pursued. On the other hand, we have (what is in itself a derogation from the desired ideal) the compilation of an addition to the Roman missal sent to him, an addition made on the express ground that those who are to use this missal will look for and demand the masses, offices,

functions contained in the supplement and largely drawn from the *Gelasianum*. The conclusion is inevitable that this earlier Roman mass-book was, at the close of the eighth century, the dominant rite throughout these regions which formed the backbone of the Carolingian monarchy and main seat of power of the ruling house, and that the Gallican rite had in these quarters by slow degrees given place to it; though that rite very probably still remained, in a great measure, the use of those south-western districts of France which were a dependent rather than a ruling fraction of the kingdom.

But can the book thus entitled, whether rightly or wrongly, "Gelasian" be identified with any extant manuscript? The so-called Leonine sacramentary, though Roman, is a mere collection of materials; and confronted with Alcuin's supplement, shows that it cannot be the book sought for. Besides the Gregorian, there is only one other book which claims to be the book of the sacraments, or missal of the Roman Church, the earliest manuscript of which, and the only one known of that recension, is now re-edited by the Rev. H. A. Wilson. Comparing the text of this book and the supplement, it is evident that Alcuin derived a large proportion of his material from a book belonging to this class, and that here we have in substance one of the "Gelasian" missals mentioned in the ninth century, which, previous to that date, had become denizen in Gaul.

In the light of the facts thus ascertained, we may revert to the remarks of M. Duchesne on this manuscript, and his statement that it was copied from a Roman original some time between the years 628 and 731. It seems to be overlooked in some quarters that after all Duchesne only touches on this question of the particular *Gelasianum* so far as his immediate purpose requires, and that in the vagueness so common in the treatment of liturgical questions it is very necessary to recall to inquirers such simple facts as data to work back from; and it is not the fault of that writer, whose whole book teaches quite another lesson, if a starting-point is by some readers taken for the conclusion of the whole matter. But what is now in question is a point which Duchesne does not discuss, viz., when did the Gelasian book first find its way into Gaul? And here it would seem that the mere obvious facts of the case postulate

that this must have taken place at some date considerably earlier than the age of the oldest existing manuscript, namely at the close of the seventh or beginning of the eighth century. The space of some seventy, eighty, or hundred years is far too limited to allow of so wide a spread in the Frankish kingdom of a new and non-native mass-book. The period 650-750 was largely, too, one of civil disturbance and foreign invasion, with a weakened central authority, or with rulers, civil and ecclesiastical alike, interesting themselves not overmuch in ecclesiastical life or the progress of religion. In this case the book imported from abroad was imposed by neither statesman and prelate nor by monarch. No record is left of the gradual steps by which the *Gelasianum* obtained so wide a popularity on this side of the Alps; we are confronted with the completed fact, which has to be explained by such general considerations as a knowledge of the times and the then common mode of procedure show to be just. Whether the initiative came from above or below, from bishop or individual priest or abbot, zealous for novelty, or prepossessed by education or taste for the fashions of Rome, we know not. A large freedom then existed in such matters. It may be that the book thus brought from Rome was more methodised, more complete than any that at the time was in use in Gaul; the extant Gallican books make this not unlikely; and thus, quite apart from its origin, it may have had in itself, in the eyes of those who adopted it, a strong practical recommendation. It must have thus spread from church to church, diocese to diocese, left to make its own way by steps that cannot now be determined; and in its progress incorporating elements derived from rites already existing in these regions, and in its turn contributing elements to the mass-books already there in use. And this consideration again furnishes striking evidence how widely the Roman books must have been spread in the Frankish kingdom already in the seventh century, and shows in what manner they were appreciated.* Four extant missals of that or the immediately succeeding age have hitherto passed as representing the liturgy of the Gallican rite.† Just as Gallican

* The question of any influence of the *Gregorianum* in France in the seventh century and first half of the eighth is a subject which deserves a special and minute investigation.

† I say nothing of the pure Gallican masses first edited by Fr. J. Mone,

elements are found fused with the original Roman book in the earliest manuscript of the *Gelasianum* so in these "Gallican" missals, on the Gallican foundation there have been worked in Roman prayers, Roman offices, in a way which shows that in those centuries it is no longer correct to speak in the strict sense of the Gallican rite in these Gallic lands, but at most of a Romanised Gallican, so deeply are the only extant books penetrated with Romanism. We may take them one by one according to the summary account of the case as given by Duchesne. First, in the so-called *Missale Gallicum*, or sacramentary of Autun, the purest of the four, "all the formulæ are arranged according to the order of the Gallican mass; but many of them (as regards the text), especially in the masses in honour of the saints, are Roman formulæ." Secondly, in the *Missale Gallicanum vetus*, "there is, as in the Autun sacramentary, a large proportion of Roman elements." Thirdly, in the so-called *Missale Francorum*, which in the thirteenth century was preserved in the Abbey of St. Denis, the Roman element is so strong and the Gallican so subordinate, that M. Duchesne has removed it from the series of Gallican books in order to class it with the Roman. As regards the fourth manuscript, the *Sacramentarium Gallicanum*, or missal of Bobbio, the masses contained in it show Gallican formulæ up to the preface. Henceforward they appear to have been said according to "the Roman form given at the beginning of the book."*

On review we find, therefore: (1) actual evidence of the *Gelasianum* in use in a wide stretch of the Frankish kingdom; (2) its use to a large extent in the compilation of the supplement to the *Gregorianum*; (3) the statement of the compiler that this was done because the book thus used was so popular; (4) evidence of its influence in all extant missals of

which belong to an earlier period. The Reichenau MS. 253 at Karlsruhe is a palimpsest; the leaves of a Gallican *libellus missalis* have been used for copying the commentary of Jerome on St. Matthew. This copy was made partly before the end of the seventh century, partly in the eighth. Delisle (*Anciens Sacramentaires*, No. vii.) has taken the age of the Jerome manuscript for the age of the mass-book; Duchesne (*Origines*, p. 145) simply quotes Delisle. Mone considers the mass book to have been written in any case not later than the middle of the sixth century (*Lateinische und Gr. Messen*, pp. 10, 151-152).

* There can be now no doubt that the missal is of Irish compilation, not improbably at Bobbio itself. Duchesne was not aware of the intimate connection between it and the original portion of the Stowe missal.

the Gallican rite of the seventh and eighth centuries. To whichever side of the problem we turn, we are met with the same evidence, clear and unmistakable, of this widely-spread Romanising tendency in the liturgy of Gallican churches in the seventh and eighth centuries, and already not in slight and modest beginnings, but in an advanced stage of development. Until the day shall come when, by discovery of new or unexpected sources of information, we are assured of a sudden outbreak of enthusiasm for Roman rites and practices in the Frankish kingdom some time during the course of the seventh century—a revolution of which there is no trace in the historical monuments of that age—we must have recourse to an explanation consonant both with the dictates of good sense and with what is known as to the methods of the time, and postulate a period long enough to allow of the gradual extension and popularisation of the new rite, bringing its introduction into connection with the efforts of so many Gallican Councils of the sixth century to effect at once a greater liturgical uniformity at home and in some respects an approximation to the practices existing in Rome. A full and deliberate survey of all the circumstances of the case leads to the conclusion of F. J. Mone (who was almost the first to insist on the necessity of carrying on liturgical investigations with a continual reference to the history of the time), that the introduction of the *Gelasianum* into Gaul must be thrown back into the sixth century. And indeed this is a conclusion in no wise contradicted by the internal evidence of the earliest extant manuscript of that missal which evidently embodies a discipline, order and rite well corresponding with that age.*

* There exists, so far as I know, the description of only one missal of the sixth century, a missal compiled by Maximian, Archbishop of Ravenna (546–556, 7); the account is given, too, by a thorough-paced antiquary who had himself examined it. It was evidently in two books—one *per anni circulum*, the second for masses of saints—and omitted the votive masses which comprise the bulk of the third book in the Gelasianum, the cotidian masses (in which those for Sundays may be included) being placed in the first book. Maximian (says Agnellus, the biographer of the Archbishops of Ravenna, writing about the year 840), “edidit missales per totum circulum anni et sanctorum omnium. Cotidianis namque et quadragesimalibus temporibus vel quidquid ad ecclesiae ritum pertinet, omnia ibi sine dubio inveniatis.” He says these *missales* formed a goodly volume “grande volumen” (*M. G. SS. rer. Langob.* p. 332). The writer’s Latin is his own, and is untouched by the Carolingian revival, and he is magniloquent; but his meaning is clear enough; and whilst it is impossible to bring this description into agreement with

The most recent editor of the older (or Vatican) manuscript of "The Gelasian Sacramentary," just issued by the Clarendon Press, the Rev. H. A. Wilson, has already laid those who are interested in liturgical studies under an obligation by his most useful index to the Roman sacramentaries. It was not the editor's intention to produce a definitive edition, but merely to provide "a text more convenient and more accessible than those of the earlier editions, and more accurate than that which is included in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*." But he has done a great deal more than this. Besides a new collation of the Vatican manuscript by another hand, the editor has himself examined and collated two of the more recent manuscripts (those of Rheinau and St. Gallen), the contents of which were already printed by Gerbert, but in a manner which makes his print almost useless. A slight amount of help has also been obtained from other sources; and printed texts of missals of the eighth or ninth century, and sometimes of later date, have been drawn upon to a much greater extent than by the last editor, Vezzosi. The large body of variants thus obtained is ranged after each section; * in the outer margin of the text are references to other sacramentaries in which each prayer may be found, and in the inner margin is given the pagination of Muratori's *Liturgia Romana Vetus*; whilst there is a special note of items also found in the *Gregorianum*. It may be said, shortly, that the editor has been ingenious in providing for the convenience of those who use his volumes. The Appendix (pp. 317-371), giving an exact account of the contents of the Rheinau and St. Gallen manuscripts (also carefully described in the Introduction), is not the least valuable portion of the book. These manuscripts, both of the eighth century, no longer show a division of the sacramentary into books; but, as in the *Gregorianum*, the feasts of saints are now incorporated in the ecclesiastical year so as to form one series, whilst, on the other hand, the portions of the earlier

either the Leonine or Gregorian books, it accords easily enough with the Gelasian type.

* Seeing that the notes on each section are commonly twenty, thirty, sometimes sixty, and even more, it would have been a considerable saving both of time and eyesight had the variants been placed at the foot of each page and kept separate from the substantial notes. But this, perhaps, was a matter depending on the Press rather than the Editor.

recension relating to the sacraments is eliminated and designed to be cast into a second part or appendix. They also give that full series of Sundays after Pentecost, an arrangement unknown in Rome until after the adoption of the Carolingian sacramentary arranged by Alcuin. The volume, therefore, presents the Gelasian Sacramentary in two stages of development, namely, the form in which it is found in France at the close of the seventh century (the Vatican MS.), and at the close of the eighth (the MSS. of Rheinau and St. Gallen); thus giving an earlier and a later recension.

There remains to be considered the question, what addition Mr. Wilson's volume makes to our knowledge of the earliest mass-book of the Roman Church. For the investigation of the earliest stages and changes of that book, the information he gives as to the two manuscripts of the later recension shows that the value of this recension is but slight; it is still to criticism exercised on the older manuscript here reprinted that we must look for the reconstruction, more or less certain, of the phase of the Roman liturgy lying between the collection of materials called the Leonine sacramentary and the book of St. Gregory. Mr. Wilson, with perhaps a natural prepossession in favour of manuscripts over which he has spent so much labour, seems inclined, so far as may be gathered from a guarded preface, to appraise the later books at a much higher rate. The suggestion continually recurs in his Introduction that the older recension of the *Gelasianum* offers a corrupted form of this type of mass-book, and that a truer and more genuine form is to be recovered by means of the later recension as shown in the Rheinau and St. Gallen manuscripts.

So far as can be gathered the cause of the editor's general dissatisfaction with the older *Gelasianum* seems chiefly to lie in a want of orderliness in its arrangement, and of just correspondence between the titles of the three separate books and their actual contents. Instead of exhibiting at least the first lines of a "pontifical" or a "ritual," in which "episcopal functions" and the sacraments should be conveniently collected together apart from the masses for the round of the year, this manuscript gives ordinations, preparation of catechumens, rites of baptism, intercalated or "grafted" among the masses of the year, "where there is no obvious reason for their presence, and

where they interrupt the order and natural sequence of the sacramentary” *—*i.e.*, of the masses. Moreover, the ordinations are not placed all together, but lie scattered through various parts of the first book, and at the end of the second devoted to the masses of saints’ days.

But here certain considerations which should govern our opinion generally in this matter have been overlooked by the writer. First, so far as mere “order” in liturgical books is concerned, it has been, in fact, the very slow growth of ages; and the oldest extant mass-books (Gregory’s excepted) show at most but the outlines of order. What is more important, the writer apparently does not realise how a changed discipline, and the settled change of feeling resulting from a long familiarity with modern practice, has affected our very ideas of what is or is not “order” in this matter. In the fifth and sixth centuries, just as the bishop was regarded as the ordinary minister of the sacraments or indeed of all the rites of the Church, so too the sacraments of baptism and holy orders were not regarded as isolated functions, but formed an integral part of the as yet rudimentary ecclesiastical year; and this very feature of episcopal functions incorporated in the very body of the missal is precisely what we should be prepared to expect as normal in a book which was really of an early date. Finally, some features (by no means all) which strike Mr. Wilson as anomalies are capable of explanation. Among the most considerable articles which seem to him out of place there are those which, like the forms for the consecration of a church, or for conferring minor orders, are Gallican, and therefore were not in the original Roman book. Others, like the forms of consecration of bishops, or veiling of virgins, were doubtless in it, but they could not be fixed to any special time in the ecclesiastical year. Both classes had to be “got in” somehow; and I venture to think that this operation (from the point of view taken in those days, not in our own) was performed in a manner as satisfactory as could be expected.†

* Introduction, p. xxxviii.

† It is here that prints giving the text as in the manuscripts are of service; only so can we adequately realise the almost helpless condition in which people then addressed themselves, in the Frankish lands at least, to literary tasks. In reading a work like the history of Gregory of Tours, not for facts but for mere “literature,” we feel, not merely the wrestle with language,

Mr. Wilson definitely urges only one particular point to show that the earlier manuscript now re-edited by himself is not merely corrupt, but is to be corrected by manuscripts of the later recension. This case we must now examine in detail. As a preparation for baptism at Easter there were held in the Roman Church during Lent a number of assemblies of candidates for baptism called "scrutinies," which were in fact a series of combined instructions and examinations of the catechumens. Three steps of these scrutinies * were of a specially solemn or formal character; one was entitled "at the opening of the ears," "in aurium apertione," in which the beginning of each of the four Gospels was read before the assembled catechumens, and in the two others was given a fixed and ritual explanation of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer. In the older recension of the *Gelasianum* the masses for the third, fourth, and fifth Sundays of Lent are entitled "for the scrutinies," and have direct reference to the *electi* or catechumens. Immediately following these masses in the manuscript are formulæ for the "scrutinies," and among them the forms "in aurium apertione," and for the tradition of the Creed and Lord's Prayer. In the later recension, as represented by the Rheinau and St. Gallen manuscripts, instead of masses relating to the *electi*, as in the older manuscript, there are assigned to the third, fourth, and fifth Sundays of Lent masses having no reference whatever to the catechumens, and nearly resembling those in our present missal; of course the titles as to the "scrutinies" have also here disappeared. Moreover, the Rheinau manuscript, omitting altogether the forms of the three solemn scrutinies, throws into an appendix at the end of the ecclesiastical year the three masses for those Sundays found in the older (Vatican) manuscript, and adds to them an *Ordo Baptisterii*, which gathers together in one conspectus and as one whole, the other elements relating to baptism to be found in detached parts in the latter manuscript.

but the struggle with thought required to express the writer's meaning at all. The seventh century was in a still worse plight; and it is now almost a task to realise how difficult it then was to see clearly or to think clearly, even in simple matters.

* Duchesne (*Origines*, p. 290) taking a seventh-century recension, the so-called *Ordo Romanus VII.*, represents these three ceremonies as taking place on one and the same day. But it is now possible to carry the "transposition chronologique" further back.

What conclusion is to be drawn from these facts ?

The inference [says Mr. Wilson] from these facts seems perfectly clear. The compiler of the Vatican (the older) manuscript had before him an *Ordo Baptisterii*, agreeing closely with that contained in the Rheinau manuscript, though perhaps including certain things not to be found in the Rheinau book.* But instead of transcribing it as a continuous whole, he divided it [in order] to graft the several portions of it into the sacramentary at convenient points (p. xxxviii); [and accordingly] the *Missae* for the "scrutinies" are placed among the Lent *Missae*, and assigned to the third, fourth and fifth Sunday of Lent. The hallowing of the font and the actual order of baptism are placed among the sections relating to Easter, while the rubric, which in the Rheinau manuscript follows the order of baptism, and directs that the order at Pentecost is to be the same as at Easter, is in the Vatican manuscript placed after the *missa* for the Sunday before Pentecost, and has carried along with it into this place the forms for the Baptism of the Sick, which in the Rheinau sacramentary also follow the rubric, but there form a natural appendix to the first part of the *Ordo Baptisterii* (pp. xxxvii-xxxviii).

The contention here really is that the form which is so ordered as better to accord with our present notions is the earlier. But the determination of the question whether the manuscript of later date or the older Vatican manuscript better preserves the genuine form, depends upon a question which the latest editor of the *Gelasianum* does not seem to have put to himself, and that is—Which is more in accordance with the discipline of (say) the fifth century, a series of separate stages of initiation carried over some weeks as part of the course of the ecclesiastical year, or an order in which the rite in its various stages is thrown into one whole so as to form a single office ?

He has, in matters which should be fairly obvious, looked at the case from exactly the wrong point of view, and mistaken what is old for what is new, and what is new for what is old. The ancient baptismal rite and the preparations for it (as exemplified also in the Vatican manuscript of the *Gelasianum*)

* On these words there is the following note : "The form of Confirmation may have been included in the *Ordo Baptisterii*, or it may have been placed apart from it, with other forms, for the use of the bishop. The forms for the expositions of the Gospels, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer may have formed part of the *Ordo Baptisterii*, but it is also possible they were taken from a Gallican source." This note will give an idea of the range of possibilities that seems to open out on all sides before the writer of the Introduction; and of the ease with which they suggest themselves independently of considerations of proof, of evidence, or of likelihood.

were evidently designed for a body of catechumens, of whom a large proportion would be adults; for such alone has the rite, as drawn out, its practical sense and reason, characteristics which are determinant in the first institution of ecclesiastical forms. Such observances once rooted die hard, and maintain themselves as ceremonies long after they have survived their full original meaning. In the seventh and eighth centuries among a Christian people, in Rome, in Christianised Gaul, the proportion of adult candidates for baptism must have been small; and, accordingly, for the series of preparatory services there was gradually substituted a connected order in which the originally separated elements are simplified and brought into one whole. The *Ordo Baptisterii* of the later Gelasian manuscript, and, it may be added, of Alcuin's supplement, shows the development from the old to the new, and represents a stage perfectly consonant with the generally modernised style observable throughout those manuscripts in detail and in general disposition. The older Gelasian manuscript still preserves the record of an older practice which had become obscured even in the *Ordo Romanus VII.* of the seventh century. It does not assign explicitly by rubric the three solemn scrutinies to the third, fourth and fifth Sundays of Lent; but that this is doubtless meant and was the practice is shown by the recently recovered Naples Calendar (the actual manuscript of which could not be later than the first half of the seventh century), which entitles the third Sunday "quando psalmi accipiunt,"* the fourth "quando orationem accipiunt," the fifth "quando symbulum accipiunt." This Calendar, as a whole, shows a practice akin to, though distinct from, the Roman; and there can be little doubt that it and the older recension of the *Gelasianum* both represent in practice the same stage of development, dating at least as early as the close of the sixth century; that is, they show a pre-Gregorian discipline. The order of baptism, passing as the *Ordo Romanus VII.*, is based on this early baptismal discipline, but is, according to Duchesne, a recension of the seventh century; it throws the three solemn scrutinies into a single service on a day in the fourth week of Lent, and expressly contemplates the catechumens as *infantes*.

* Dom Germain Morin here suggests "salem" (*Anecdota Maredsolana*, tom. i., *Liber comicus*, p. 432).

The old rite, though it had fallen out of the missal, was not yet dropped, but it had already reached the merely ceremonial stage. It was now only a question of time to reach universally that *Ordo Baptisterii* given in the later manuscripts of the *Gelasianum*, on which is based the order of baptism of the present Roman ritual, an order still retaining, in the different places assigned for different parts of the form for adults, traces of that primitive separation of rites now fused into a single continuous service.

There are, undoubtedly, at various points, marks of dislocation in the early book, and the editor does good service in calling attention to them. But the instance which he has chosen to dwell upon cannot be justly classed among the number. The contention that a ritual antiquity, defaced in the Vatican manuscript, can be restored by means of the later recension, is mistaken. The later texts have an importance and value of their own, but they illustrate the history of the transition from the older practice in the Frankish kingdom to the universal adoption of the *Gregorianum*; and are not proper to help us in reconstructing the Roman rites of an earlier age.

To any one who follows with attention recent literature on the subject of early liturgy, it is evident that M. Duchesne's book on the "Origins of Christian Worship" has set ideas on the subject all in disarray. There is in our days a desire, perhaps excessive, to be up to date and be critical, scientific; but then this book makes it so difficult to know what view to take on so many points of important detail. And indeed there is much excuse for the puzzled attitude of mind of the specialists, which exists in fact, however decorously the fact may be concealed from the eye of the profane. Duchesne goes along his own road, in irregular and unsystematic fashion; he points with the finger now in this direction, now in that, and there are interesting conjunctures when the indications seem to be almost contradictory. Sometimes he simply disregards the by-paths he himself points out; sometimes he enters upon them but only to stop short provokingly just at the point where his guidance is most needed. There runs through his rapid survey something of a good-humoured contempt for his audience, which is not a little disconcerting; and he probably knew them well. The *Origines* is a book which, though professing

by its form to be a work of popularisation, can only be used as it should be by those best able to form an opinion for themselves; and it will be most highly valued, be found most useful, and be most frequently consulted by those least at the author's mercy.

A reaction from an exaggerated traditionalism, as exemplified in the methods of the first volume of Dom Guéranger's *Institutions Liturgiques*, was inevitable; and it was natural that it should manifest itself most clearly in France. The reaction which has, in fact, ensued shows, like such movements generally, a tendency on its side to exaggeration, though doubtless even in exaggeration it has greatly helped to bring into clear relief the problems that have to be dealt with, and to disengage in many respects bare truth of fact. The question of the origins of the Roman mass-book is only one item of a subject which, if satisfactory and fairly sure results are to be arrived at, must be studied not merely with exactness in isolated points of detail, but as a whole in all its bearings.

The charming (but, so far as origins are concerned,* giddily written and immature) book on the "History of the Roman Breviary," by M. Pierre Batiffol, probably marks a term of reaction, although for a time it is to be expected that the many persons who would desire to appear on the level of scientific progress at little cost to themselves, will readily appropriate, without further inquiry, the newest theories. There are not wanting signs, however, that a sober review of the whole evidence must issue, as regards the earliest Roman mass-books, in a recognition that the traditional names "Gelasian" and "Gregorian" represent, as applied to the books hitherto passing under those names, a practical truth, the neglect of which must turn the history of the liturgy in the West into a mere enigma; and that the *Gelasianum* is substantially the Roman mass-book of the sixth century.

The foregoing article was in type when the unexpected intelligence arrived of the death of Dom Bäumer. He had already finished his work on the history of the Breviary, which is

* I mean particularly the second and third chapters.

passing through the press, and he was about to address himself to his further task of the early history of the Roman, or rather Western, Liturgy. The materials gathered during a long course of years were in hand, the plan was sketched, and the work had been so far meditated on and thought out, that a few months would have sufficed for its completion. By his death sacred learning suffers a heavy loss; there is no one ready to take his place. To his brethren in religion, to his friends, the loss is more grievous still of one who was so truly simple of heart and single of eye; so upright, so penetrated with the loving fear of God.

EDMUND BISHOP.

ART. II.—THE MEDIÆVAL SERVICE BOOKS OF AQUITAINE.

I.—ALBI.

THE diocese of Albi has always professed to follow closely the usages of Rome. This is proved not only from the ancient Sacramentaries and other MSS. which have survived destruction, but also from the statutes of various bishops of the See.

About the year 1260, the canons, then living in cloister under the rule of St. Augustine, began to manifest their wish for secularisation, but despite their applications, the change was not effected till 1297, when Pope Boniface VIII. issued a bull, dated 4 kalends of January, granting their repeated request. It is specially stipulated in it that the Roman use continue to be observed. Bishop Bernard de Castanet—the builder of the existing cathedral—by his statutes, dated April 3, 1298, provides for the appointment of four chaplains (*hebdomadarii altaris maioris*), two deacons, two sub-deacons, nine choir-boys—“*bene cantantes*”—and two masters over them; all of whom are to be present in choir during the day and night offices.

The bull allowed each canon to appoint a vicar, and the bishop now orders that the thirty-one vicars are to be perpetual and not amovable; and that they wear “*vestes talaris de panno*” as becometh honest clerks, with “*calceamenta honesta cum caligis nigris*.” Their tonsure is to be round in shape, and their hair clipped short. From Easter to All Saints they are to wear in church clean surplices, but in winter-time over the surplice a “*cappa nigra de saia*.”

A bull of Benedict XII., dated v ides of July 1335, further regulates the vesture and conduct of the clergy in choir. From All Saints to Easter the canons are to wear over the surplice a black “*cappam longam scissam ante pectus*,” and carry amysses of uniform pattern. Each on entering and leaving the choir is to bow lowly to the altar with uncovered head. The tonsure is to be seemly, and their hair clipped

and beards shaved on the vigils of Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and All Saints, also on the eves of the four feasts of B.V.M. and of the Holy Cross, and of the Angels and Apostles which have preceding vigils. Likewise for the festival of Blessed Cecily, and at other convenient times—"tonderi faciant atque radi." Dogs and hawks are not to be kept by the clergy, nor secular dress worn outside the church. Each canon, on his appointment, is to present one cope of the value of at least fifteen *livres tournois* to the cathedral. There are to be ten boys in choir, "apti et bene cantantes."

In 1400, the bishop—Dominic of Florence—reduced the number of canons to twenty-one. This was owing to the diminution of the revenues of the chapter, caused by war and other calamities.

Louis d'Amboise, the great benefactor of the cathedral, by his statutes, dated July 5, 1476, regulated the order of services and other matters connected with his church.

By his ordinances, the bells are to ring for matins at all seasons between 3 A.M. and 4 A.M. and the ringing finished between 4 A.M. and 5 A.M., at which hour matins and lauds are to be said, followed by prime and Mass for the Dead ("missa obitûs"). The matins of Christmas, Ascension and Pentecost, however, are to be sung at the customary hour. On Sundays and feasts of double and semi-double rite the bells are to ring when *Te Deum* begins, and continue ringing till the verse "*Pleni sunt cœli*," &c. When *Te Deum* is not sung they are to ring during the ninth response of matins. From Easter to Michaelmas the bells are to ring for tierce between 7 A.M. and 8 A.M., and at 8 o'clock tierce is to be said, but from Michaelmas to Easter one hour later.

After tierce the procession, when there is one, is to be made, followed by High Mass. The bells are to ring for vespers from 2 to 3 P.M.

No canon is to walk through the city alone, but he is to be accompanied by two (or at least one) honest servants. The canons and other clergy are to shave their beards on the vigils mentioned in the bull above, and are not to go longer than ten days without shaving.

From All Saints to Easter the canons and clergy are to wear the surplice (without sleeves, if they like to do so), but on no

account a rochet, and over the surplice the black "cappa," open down the front, with a small black hood.

From Easter to All Saints the "cappa" is to be replaced by the amyss. No wooden sabots (*sotulares ligneos*) nor pattens (*callopodia ferrata*) are to be worn in choir under penalty of losing three days' pay. Neither are pistols (*sclopos*) to be carried in church.

At matins, tierce and vespers, the canon or chaplain singing the office is to intone distinctly the Paternoster with uncovered head, which ended he is to rise and sing the *Domine labia mea*, or *Deus in adjutorium*. While the antiphon after the *Benedictus* and *Magnificat* is being sung, the officiant is to go with the acolytes and thurifer, preceded by one of the beadles (*marrellari*), to the altar step, and there sing the collect from a covered desk (*pulpitum*). The canons are to wear copes in choir during the High Mass on the feasts of Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, Assumption, All Saints and St. Cecily. (This custom is still observed.)

At all High Masses at the high altar the celebrant is to recite the psalm—*Judica me Deus*—according to the liturgy of the Roman Church—"cujus officium tenemus."

The celebrant and ministers are to sit during the singing of the gradual. (This custom is still in full force.) There are other directions for the due and reverent celebration of Mass.

The paschal candle is not to be removed from its place until the benediction of the font on the vigil of Pentecost.

After compline, the commemoration of the B.V.M. is to be made by the following anthems: in Advent, *Gabriel angelus*; from Christmas to Easter, and from Ascension to Advent, *Ave regina celorum*, except on Saturdays, when *Salve Regina* is to be sung; from Easter to Ascension, the *Regina cæli*.

On July 13, 1494, Louis d'Amboise published further statutes for his cathedral. Three strokes on the great bell are to be given at the elevation at the daily High Mass. No canon or other cleric is to enter the church with bare legs or feet. There is to be no talking together or gossiping (*confabulationes*) in choir. The canons and clergy on entering the choir shall uncover their heads, and bow lowly to the altar, "because the Body of Christ is ever preserved there."

By a bull, dated 7 kalends of March 1531 — Pope

Clement VII. grants to the clergy of the cathedral the use of the rochet and "cappa-magna." "Roquetam et magnam et longam cappam, et super illa capucium magnum. Canonici videlicet et hebdomadarii rubeo, alia vero Beneficiati præfati nigro raso."

The above rules and regulations are extracted from a collection of bulls and statutes relating to Albi, now preserved in the library of the Grand Seminary.

Pope Alexander VI., in 1493, confirmed a further statute made by Louis d'Amboise, whereby it is ordered that in future, at each choir-office recited in the cathedral, sixteen wax tapers, each weighing one pound, shall be lighted and burnt during the service.* This was probably after the erection by the bishop of the new high altar, ordered by him to be made in Paris, and for which he entered into contract with certain metal founders of that city in 1484.†

When the inventory of the goods and chattels of the Chapter was taken in 1789, previous to their confiscation, there were found in the cathedral library 1984 printed books and 124 manuscripts, the earliest of the latter dating from the seventh century; and in the sacristy many graduals and antiphonaries on vellum, some of them richly illuminated, particularly one containing the office for the feast of St. Cecily, which was full of beautiful miniatures and bound in red morocco, with clasps and corners of bronze-gilt.

Dom Martene, when he visited Albi some years earlier, saw many fine and ancient sacramentaries, a Gratian embellished with sixty miniatures, and a MS. containing some works of Cicero, some books of Euclid and treatises on mathematics, which belonged formerly to Popes Gregory XI. and Clement VII., and afterwards formed one of the volumes of Louis d'Amboise's library, bequeathed by that bishop to the chapter.‡

Massol, who conducted the commissioners during their inspection, pointed out to them many valuable "incunables" and rare editions among the printed books. When the cathedral library was transferred to the care of the municipality, this renegade canon obtained the post of city librarian.

* "Hist. Gen. de Languedoc," ed. 1874, t. v.

† "Bib. Nat." Fonds Doat. MS. 112.

‡ "Voyage Littéraire," 1717.

During his tenure of office he made away with many MSS. and books committed to his charge, and in fact disposed of the greater part of these literary treasures entrusted to his keeping by selling them to collectors, or exchanging them for modern works suited to the literary attainments and tastes of his employers. In 1820, he boasted that he had "purged" the library of many of these *inutilités* by giving them to the celebrated Irish collector Mac-Carthy Reagh, in exchange for one copy of Buffon's Natural History.*

Despite his wicked depredations the town library of Albi still remains in possession of a few valuable and early liturgical manuscripts. Arranging these in order of date we find three MSS. belonging to the ninth century—viz. :

MS. 36.—Calendar of Archdiocese of Bourges (A.D. 854),
fo. vellum.

„ 44.—Antiphonary, 4to vellum.

„ 42.—A collection of "Benedictiones," 4to vellum.

Of a date from 950 to 1025 :

MS. 4.—Sacramentary, vellum, oblong.

„ 34.—Pontificale. 4to, vellum.

Of the end of eleventh or beginning of twelfth century :

MS. 3.—Rituale Albiensis, vellum, oblong. In red and black letters with coloured capitals ; in handwriting of Archdeacon Sicard.

MS. 6.—Sacramentary, vellum, black and red lettering, illuminated capitals, also written by Archdeacon Sicard. A very beautiful and clean copy, as it was reserved for the use of the bishop, as is proved by the Benedictions inserted, and other details.

MS. 5.—Sacramentary, vellum ; also by Archdeacon Sicard, but of later date than MSS. 3 and 6, and with additions by a later hand.

MS. 15.—Lectionary, parchment, 4to.

MS. 13.—Book of the Gospels, vellum, 4to.

Of twelfth to thirteenth century :

MS. 9.—Diurnale et Rituale, 4to, vellum.

Of fourteenth to fifteenth century :

MS. 8.—Martyrology, kalendar, necrology, &c., vellum.

* Du Mège, in "Archéologie Pyrénéenne," i. c.

Besides early MSS. of the Bible, New Testament, Psalter, Horæ, and other office books of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and of later date.*

The ancient Sacramentary (MS. 4) is full of interest. It contains no less than one hundred and twenty-two proper prefaces for the Sundays and Feasts. The title on fol. 1 is: INCIPIT | LIBER SA | .RAMEN | TORUM | PER C . . CV | LVM A . . . | On fol. 2 is the common preface, followed by the canon of the Mass. The commemoration of the dead, before 'Nobis quoque' is wanting in the original, but is added in a later hand on the margin.

The names of "Ilario, Martino" are added to the saints commemorated in "Nobis quoque" after "Petro."

The canon ends with the first Agnus Dei, immediately after which, and on the same line, comes VIII KLĒN | IANVAR ORATIO | IN VIGILIA DNI. The midnight Mass of Christmas is headed IN NOCTE AD SCĀ MARIĀ, and in the second Mass the collect, secret and post-communion of St. Anastasia precede those of Christmas. Two prefaces are provided for this Mass of Aurora, and for the third Mass five post-communions. On the Feast of St. John the Evangelist there is a proper collect for use at vespers. No ferial Masses are given for Lent. On Palm Sunday the "Benedictio ramis palmarum sive flōr," consists of one collect only—"Omnipotens deus Christe mundi creator et redemptor," &c. The Exultet of Holy Saturday is taken from the Gelasian formula, which begins "Deus mundi conditor." In this sacramentary it is tacked on to the opening sentence of the preface after the word "eterne." Alcuin gave it as an alternative form to the Gregorian.

Then follow the four collects, "quæ dicendes ad Lēc"—viz. :

1. Deus qui mirabiliter creasti, &c.
2. Deus cujus antiqua, &c.
3. Deus qui nos ad celebrandum, &c.
4. Deus qui ecclesiam tuam, &c.

On Easter Day proper collects are provided for vespers,

* Since the above was written, Mr. E. Bishop, to whom I am indebted for his kindly criticism and advice, has drawn my attention to the fact that MSS 4, 5, 6 have been briefly described by M. Léopold Delisle in "Mémoires de l'Institut Nat. de France, Académie des Ins. et Belles Lettres," 1886, t. 32, pp. 227-232.

“ad fontem,” “ad S. And.” During the octave there are proper collects for vespers, and “at the font”; and likewise till the Thursday inclusive for recital before the chapel or altar of S. Andrew.

On the vigil of Pentecost the prayers after the four lessons are respectively :

1. Deus qui in Abrahe, &c.
2. Deus qui nobis per prophetarum, &c.
3. Deus qui nos ad celebrandum, &c.
4. Deus incommutabilis virtus, &c.

The lessons themselves are not found in this MS., either here, or on Holy Saturday.

The first Sunday after Pentecost is entitled *DOM VACAT.*, but has the proper preface of the Holy Trinity, and the collect “Deprecationem nostram quesumus Domine benignus exaudi,” &c.

The feasts come between the Sundays—*e.g.*, S. John Baptist (for which there are two Masses), is found after the fifth Sunday after Pentecost, S. Benedict after the eighth Sunday. The feast of S. Sixtus, besides its own proper preface, has the “prefatio” for the Benediction of the Grapes, *BEN. UVE* in the canon of the Mass at the end of “Nobis quoque.”

There are Masses for twenty-seven Sundays after Pentecost, followed by five Sundays “ante nativitatem domini.”

The feast of S. Lucy has two Masses. After the Mass for S. Thomas the Apostle come those of the Common of Saints, followed by votive Masses : prayers “ad capilla tundenda” and “barbas tonend,” various gospels and epistles, the exorcisms of salt and water, and benedictions for the same. The various forms—*AD COMMŪ* : *POST COM* : *AD CŌPL.* are found as titles to the post-communions. There are no rubrics in this sacramentary.

In the Pontificale (MS. 34) are two collects for a Mass “contra demoniaco,” and a form of benediction of the hot water used at trial by ordeal.

B. super Aqua ferventis.—Deus iudex justus . fortis et patiens . qui auctor es pacis et iudicas equitatem . tu iudica quod justum est, domine . et rectum da iudicium . qui respicis terram et facis eam tremere . tu es deus omnipotens . qui per adventum filii tui domini nostri ihū xpī mundum salvasti . et sanctissima passione ejus humanum genus

redemisti . tu hanc aquam igne ferventem sanctifica . qui tres pueros id est Sidrac Misac et Abdenago in camino ignis ardentis accensa fornace salvasti . illosque per angelum tuum eduxisti . tu clemens sanctissime dominator presta . ut siquis innocens de hoc furto in hanc aquam igne ferventem manum miserit . sicut tres pueros supradictos in camino ignis salvasti . et Susannam de falso crimine liberasti : ita et qui innocens de hoc furto in hanc aquam igne ferventem manum miserit salvam et illesam educat . Ita deus omnipotens si quis est culpabilis in crassante diabolo cor induratum habens manum mittere presumpserit . tua justissima severitas hoc declaret huic in corpore suo . ut certa veritas sit manifesta . et anima per penitentiam salvetur . et si quis culpabilis est et per aliqua maleficia aut per herbas peccata sua regere voluit . tua dextera hoc evacuare dignetur . Per eundum.

This differs from the prayer in the various rites for trial by ordeal quoted by Dom Martene.*

The Rituale of Albi (MS. 3) has an index of its contents on fol. 2, headed :

“PRENOTAT HIC CALAMUS QUOD CONTINET ISTE LIBELLUS.” In this list are the benedictions of salt and water, bread, wine, grapes and figs, fruit, salt “ad pecora,” “ad eulogias,” the pannier and staff for a journey, at haircutting, at shaving, &c. ; also benedictions for use in the sacristy, in the dormitory, kitchen (coquina), hospital, bakehouse, chapter-house, refectory, buttery, barn, &c. ; followed by those used in the services of the church—viz., of candles, ashes, palms, fire, incense, paschal candle, and the paschal lamb ; the rites for the due administrations of the sacraments, the burial of the dead, the blessing of bells, hair-cloth, salt and water against lightning, and of hot irons, hot water, and candles—“ad iudicium,” or trials by ordeal. VSIBUS ECCLESIE SATIS UTILIS EST | LIBER ISTE : | SCRIPTORIS LIBRI LECTOR | MEMOR ESTO SICARDI.

Many of the prayers and ceremonies differ from those of the modern Roman ritual.

A rubric for the office on Palm Sunday orders that the clergy and people, preceded by the cross, banners and the relics of the saints, assemble at the third hour of the day at the church or place where the ceremony is to be performed. There tierce is to be said by the clergy and people standing in a circle (facta corona). The Gospel, “Cum appropinquasset Jesus” follows, which being finished the cantor sings the

* “De Antiq. Rit.” ii. 338 *et seq.* (ed. 1788).

antiphons—"Collegerunt," and "Cum appropinquaret," and while he is chanting, the Bishop, accompanied by twelve priests, approaches to bless the branches. On his arrival a clerk chants the antiphon "Ave rex noster." A prayer and proper preface and two collects are provided.

Fire and incense are blessed on Maunday Thursday, and the paschal candle on Holy Saturday is lighted from the fire thus previously hallowed.

There are two forms of exorcism (one for men, the other for women) in the rite of Baptism.

In the Litany—"Sancta Regina Celorum," the Archangels and Apostles, "Omnes SS. Innocentes," and SS. Stephen, Linus, Cletus, Clement, Xistus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Laurence, Vincent, Saturninus, Antoninus, Julian, Genesius, Hypolitus, Fabian, Sebastian, John and Paul, Tiburtius and Valerian, Cosmas and Damien, Justus and Pastor, Maurice and his companions, Denis and his companions, Victor and his companions, Irenæus and his companions, Silvester, Martial, Salvus, Leo, Gregory, Calixtus, Hilary, Martin, Brice, Eugenius, Amancius, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Nicholas, Benedict, Maurus, Placidus, Isidore, Gerald, Giles, William, Mary Magdalene, Cecilia, Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Anastatia, Praxedis, Eulalia, Scholastica, Sigolena, Marcianna, Karissima, Faith, Hope, Charity and Wisdom are invoked.

Ut episcopum et abbates seu prepositos nostros, &c.

Ut congregationem Sce Cecilie et omnium sanctorum in tuo sancto servitio conservare digneris.

Mediator Dei et hominum. Te rogamus, &c.

The marriage rite is very ornate, beginning with the blessing of the bridegroom's gifts (arras). A proper Mass is provided with following preface :—

Qui foedera nuptiarum blando concordia jugo et insolubili pacis vinculo nexuisti . ut multiplicandis adobtionum filiis sanctorum conubiorum fecunditas pudica servaretur. Tua enim Domine providentia . tua gratia ineffabilibus modis utrumque dispensat . ut quod generatio ad mundi edidit ornatum . regeneratio ad ecclesie perducatur augmentum. Et ideo, &c.

Before the "Pax domini" is the prayer, "Propiciare Domine," and another preface said *super nubentes*—"Deus qui potestate virtutis tue de nichilo," and the priest re-

turning to the altar says "Per omnia secula seculorum. Pax." Two proper prayers follow, and then the benediction, "ad reconciliandos conjuges." * After which the priest delivers the bride to the bridegroom, saying, "Accipe eam in nomine Patris, &c. Ite in pace."

An office follows for the visitation of the newly-married couple in their house, where the bed is incensed, and the blessing of "S. Thomas the Apostle" is given them.

This *Rituale* ends with the following beautiful antiphon to Our Lady :

O Maria, Virgo perpetua, placca nobis Deum, quia pro nobis Dei mater facta es. Surge O pia mater nostra. Surge amplectere filium pro filiis. Ostende mamillas sacras quas ipse dulciter suxit. Ostende manus immaculatas ante faciem redemptoris nostri. Alleluia.

XI. Mater patrum et nati filia patrem ora jube natum pia ut nos ducat ad polorum gaudia.

The first two folios of MS. 6 contain a memorandum, written by B. Grossi, sacristan of the church of Albi, "in crastinum festi beate lucie virginis Anno dni M.CC.XLVIII.," relating to the reciprocal duties of the bishop and chapter, according to the ordinances and rules laid down and agreed to by Durantus, the bishop, and Dominus B. de Combreto, the provost, as binding on themselves and successors, and the canons of St. Cecily. The original agreement was drawn by Master Guillelmus Biscaroni, notary, of which this is a copy. According to the arrangement then made and entered into by the contracting parties, the bishop is to officiate at the procession and High Mass in his cathedral on the following feasts—viz., Christmas Day, the Purification of Blessed Mary, Palm Sunday, Maunday Thursday (in die jovis sc̄a), Holy Saturday, Easter Day, the Vigil of Pentecost, Whitsunday, the Assumption of Blessed Mary, and the Exaltation of the Holy Cross. On these days the bishop (if he be willing), by ancient episcopal right, hereby renewed to him by the provost and chapter, can and ought to be entertained by them in the refectory at dinner only, together with eight persons of his household, at the expense of the chapter.

But on the feast of S. Cecily, the bishop, with sixteen of his

* According to MS. 5, this is the benediction given, "ad secundas nuptias."

household, and the officers of his spiritual and temporal courts in the city of Albi, are to dine in the refectory at the expense of the chapter.

On Maunday Thursday the bishop is to dine in the said refectory with the provost, canons, and other clergy of the cathedral, whom he is to entertain at his own cost.

If the bishop be unable or unwilling to eat in the refectory on the said Thursday, and if he be in the city or diocese at the time, then he shall pay for the entertainment: to the provost xii solidos ramundens; to the prior, viiis.; to each archdeacon, vis.; to the sacristan, iiis.; to each of the other canons, iiis.; to each "donat," ijs.; and to each of the chaplains, and to the two clerks, xviii deniers ramundens. Provided always that the said persons shall have been present at the High Mass, unless prevented by sickness. If the bishop be absent from his diocese on this day, the above payments cannot be exacted.

The sacramentary begins on fol. 4.

Cvi fieri servam me lavdo Sicardvs in evvm
Hvnc tibi describo librvm Cecilia virgo.

INCIPIIT LIBER

SACRAMENTORVM

P. ANNI CIRCVLVM.

followed immediately by "Per omnia secula seculorum," &c., before the common preface. On the lower part of this page is a drawing of Our Lord in a vesica supported by two seraphim in chasubles. Below it are the opening words of the canon TE IGITUR CLEMEN.

In the "Libera nos," after the Paternoster, St. Michael's name is inserted—"Maria et sancto archangelo tuo Michael, et beatis apostolis," &c.

The Pax domini, &c., is followed by the Agnus Dei. Then come these prayers:

1. Hec sacro sancta commixtio corporis et sanguinis dñi. nostri ihesu xpi fiat omñibus sumentibus salus mentis et corporis et ad vitam capescendam eternam preparatio salutaris . Te prestari . te rex regum qui in trinitate perfecta vivis et regnas.

2. *Ante Communionē.*—Domine sancte pater omnipotens aeterne deus . da michi hoc corpus et sanguinem dñi nri ihu xpi filii tui . ita sumere . ut merear per hoc remissionem omnium peccatorum meorum accipere . et

tuo sancto spiritu replei . et aeternae vite hereditatem percipere sine fine . quia tu es deus et preter te non est alius.

3. *Post Comunionem*.—Perceptio corporis et sanguinis tui domine ihu xpe quam ego indignus et infelix sumere presumpti . non michi proveniat ad iudicium . neque ad condemnationem . sed prosit michi ad remissionem omnium peccatorum meorum . sitque ad percipiendam vitam aeternam preparatio salutaris . te prestante deus noster qui cum patre et spiritu sco vivis et regnas in secula seculorum.

4. *Post Missam*.—Placeat tibi, &c., ending, Te prestante, &c.

There are no rubrics in the canon. Some of the "stations" are mentioned. The proper of the season begins with the Vigil of Christmas. After the sixth Sunday—"post Theophaniam"—is the mass for "iii Non. Febrii, Hypapanti Domini." Before the Office of Good Friday is a rubric that the Mass is not to be sung, "neque in Sabbato . donec ad vigiliis noctis." Seven lamps are to be lighted at the altar where the Mass of the Presanctified is said; the bishop and his ministers are to wear the Lenten vestments—"non nudis pedibus." After he has reached the throne a small linen cloth is to be spread on the bare altar. Two deacons are devoutly to prepare the cross for veneration. The sub-deacon and deacon go to the tomb, where the former receives a chalice with wine, and the latter the "Corpus Domini." On their return the antiphon "Hoc corpus" is sung. No incense is offered, nor is "Orate fratres" said. The celebrant places the Particle in the chalice—"nichil dicens, nisi forte dicere aliquid voluerit. Deinde communicent omnes cum silencio, et post paululum dicuntur vespere."

On Holy Saturday the paschal candle is to be lighted from the fire—"quod V feria de silice et xpistallo excussus fuerit"—and the reader from the pulpit (in ambone) reads the four lessons provided.

The litanies are to be said in the choir, the first seven times, the second five times, and the third thrice. After the blessing of the font, and the administration of baptism, the litanies are repeated in choir, and at "propitius esto," all the bells are to be rung. At the Agnus Dei the "Magister schole" is to sing thrice in a loud voice "Accendite," and the whole church is illuminated. Then follows the festal "Kyrie eleison," and the bishop sings solemnly the "Gloria in excelsis."

The exuberant number of proper prefaces of the old sacramentary is reduced to the limited number of the Roman Missal in this MS., but there are proper prefaces, in addition, for the Invention of the Cross, S. Cecily, and the Mass of Requiem (wherein the name of the dead person is mentioned).

The feast of the Holy Trinity is observed, and there are Masses for twenty-five Sundays after Pentecost. The whole of the office on the Vigil of Pentecost is to be ended by 3 P.M. A number of "Benedictiones" are given, usually four for each feast, provided with them. The prayer at the end of each Mass is entitled "ad complendum." The proper of saints begins, "ab octabis Pentecostes usque in natale Domini," and the Vigil of St. Cecily has a Mass.

The Sacramentary (MS. 5) is the one quoted by Le Brun in his *Explication de la Messe*,—"un fort beau Sacramentaire de l'église d'Alby qui paraît être écrit vers l'an 1100," as a partial copy of this MS. is among his papers in the Bib. Nationale (16803). It contains a calendar, with a verse at the head of each month mentioning the unlucky days. In the margin of each page are recorded the obits of various bishops and other personages, in the handwriting of Sicard, with others added at a later date. Against the 14th of September a later scribe has inserted the words, *Sichard' archidiacon'*.

We find in this MS. the *Ordo* of the Mass before the canon, and there are a few brief rubrics.

On fol. 7 is the title :

IN NOMINE DNI NRI IHU XPI
INCIPIT LIBER SACRAMENTOR
PER CIRCVLVM ANNI
A BEATO GREGORIO PAPA
VRBIS ROME EDITVS.

In primis dum ingreditur sacerdos ad altare : dicit

A. Introibo, &c. P. Iudica, &c. A. Introibo, &c.

Kyrie eleyson. Christe eleyson. Kyrie eleyson. Pater noster, &c.

Dne ne memineris. Adjuva nos deus. Ab occultis.

Dne exaudi oration. Dns. vobiscum. Oremus.

Aufer a nobis, &c. Acciones nostras, &c. Consciencas nostras, &c.

Confiteor deo et sancte marie et omnibus sanctis et vobis fratres, peccavi nimis per superbiam, in cogitatione, loquatione, delectatione et opere mea culpa.

Misereatur tui ops dñs, dimittat tibi omnia peccata tua preterita . presentia . et futura . liberet te ab omni malo . conservet et confirmet te in omni

opere bono . et perducatur te ad vitam eternam. Amen. Indulgentiam et remissionem et absolutionem omnium peccatorum nostrorum . et spacium penitencie . et gratiam sancti spiritus tribuat nobis omnipotens et misericors dominus.

Oratio ante altare dicenda.—Deus de indignis dignos, &c.

Ad corporalia extendenda.—In conspectu tuo domine . hec nostra munera tibi placita sint . ut nos tibi placere valeamus.

Ad offerendam hostiam.—Hanc oblationem qs . omps . ds . placatus accipias . et omnium offerentium . et eorum pro quibus tibi offertur . peccata indulge. Per.

Ad calicem.—Offerimus tibi domine . ihu xpi filii tui sanguinem humiliter deprecantes ut in conspectu divinae majestatis tue cum odore suavitatis ascendat.

Deinde suplex ante altare dicat or.—Suscipe sancta Trinitas memoriam nativitatis et in honorem omnium sanctorum tuorum qui tibi placueri ab inicio mundi . ut illis, &c.

Inde surgens faciat signum crucis super sacrificium.—In nomine sancta Trinitatis et individue unitatis descendat angelus benedictionis et consecrationis super hoc munus.

In spiritu, &c.

Deinde vertat se ad populum dicens.—Obsecro vos fratres orate pro me ad deum . ut meum vestrumque sacrificium acceptabile fiat deo.

There is no response. The title is repeated here, IN NOMINE, &c.

SCRIPTORIS LIBRI LECTOR MEMOR ESTO SICARDI.

Ordo qualiter in Catholica ecclesia missa celebretur

Inprimis Antiphona ad introitum, &c. &c.

Postmodum sequitur oratio super oblata. Qua sub silentio completa.

Sacerdos expansis manibus excelsa voce reverenter dicat—

Per omnia, &c., with the Common Preface.

Item diebus solempnibus. Et ideo cum angelis, &c.

The rest is copied from MS. 6, until IIII NN. FEB. PURIFICATIO SCE MARIE, wherein slight differences begin to appear in this and following feasts.

On Easter Day three collects are given for vespers, “ad fontes,” “ad crucem,”—and proper collects for the same during the octave until “Sabbato in albis.”

The benediction of the grape appears in the canon on S. Sixtus' Day. Two Masses are provided for the feast of S. Laurence, and there is no proper preface for S. Cecily. The proper of saints begins from Easter.

On fol. 154 : HVIVS OPVS LIBI. DIGITI SICPSERE SICARDI (sic).

Eleven folios have been added. One contains the Gospel for the matins of Christmas with neumatic notation.

From a Processionale (MS. 11) of the fifteenth century we get some details of the Blessing of the Palms and other rites in use at Albi at this date.

Solemn processions in copes of cloth of gold (*aureis et cericis*) were made on the feasts of the Nativity, Circumcision, and Epiphany; Purification and Annunciation of Blessed Mary; Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Trinity, Nativity of S. John Baptist, SS. Peter and Paul, Visitation of Blessed Mary, Transfiguration, Translation of the relics of S. Cecily, Assumption and Nativity of Blessed Virgin Mary, Invention and Exaltation of the Holy Cross, S. Michael (Sept. 29), All Saints, Blessed Cecily, Conception of Blessed Virgin Mary, and the Dedication of the Church.

Solemn processions outside the church and cloister were made on Palm Sunday, the three Rogation days, and the feast of the Eucharist.

On Palm Sunday (in fine weather) the procession started from the cathedral after the Aspersion, headed by a banner, followed by the reliquaries and images of saints, the cross bearer and acolytes, and lastly the bishop in his pontifical vestments of red, or violet, with a white mitre (*sine aurifricisio*), with his ministers on foot; and wended its way to the open ground near the church of S. Salvi (*ad planum S. Salvii*), two chanters (*officiatores*) in copes intoning the antiphon, *Ave rex noster*, and the hymns *Vexilla regis*, and *Pange lingua gloriosi praelium certaminis*. After the recital of tierce, the proper Gospel, and the office of Benediction of the Palms, the bishop takes off his red cope and puts on a white cope, and the mitre with golden orphreys. He then mounts a mare covered with trappings of white cloth, and rides to the cathedral, holding in his left hand the palm, and blessing the people with the right. Two archdeacons conduct his steed, and he is accompanied by a deacon holding the pastoral staff, and a subdeacon carrying the cross (*crucem episcopalem ante pontificem* *). If the bishop be absent from his city on this day the celebrant is not to ride on the return of the procession.

* Were the bishops of Albi entitled to have an archiepiscopal crozier borne before them?

On reaching the portal of Dominic of Florence the bishop dismounts, and stands before the closed door, while the "Gloria laus et honor," and the "Attolite portas" are sung and responded to by the boys on the battlements of the gateway. After entering the church the prayer *Deus qui filium tuum pro salute nostra, &c.*, brings this office to a close, and the Mass is forthwith celebrated.

By order of Bishop D'Elbène, in 1618, that portion of the Passion called "the Synagogue" ceased to be chanted "en musique" in the cathedral, as was the old custom at Albi before this innovation.

R. TWIGGE.

ART. III.—THE REAL JOAN OF ARC.

1. *La Vraie Jeanne d'Arc.* Par JEAN BAPTISTE-JOSEPH AYROLES, S.J. Paris : Gaume et Cie. 1890, 1894, *et seq.*
2. *The Maid of Orleans.* By the Rev. FRANCIS M. WYNDHAM, M.A. London : St. Anselm's Society. 1894.

THE radiant figure of the inspired girl charged by heaven with the deliverance of France in her darkest hour has a unique place in secular history. Nowhere, outside the pages of the sacred story, is there in the records of the government of the universe, such another case of the immediate and visible intervention of Providence in the guidance of human affairs. The episode of the Maid of Orleans is as marvellous as any fable of mythology, and yet its main outlines have come down to us attested by such evidence as can be adduced in proof of no other historical fact, the records of a double judicial investigation, with the verbatim report of the depositions of the witnesses. The miracles of other saints are recorded in ecclesiastical annals alone. Joan's changed the course of history, and affected to all time the destinies of two great nations. Crowned with the threefold halo of heroism, sanctity, and martyrdom, she stands out as the intermediary between the world of the spirit and that of the flesh, as a creature more angelic than human, lent to earth for a brief time and a special purpose. A rude peasant maiden chosen as the ambassadress of heaven, she delivered its message with unfaltering fidelity to the great ones of this lower world, whose terrestrial splendours could indeed have had but little power to dazzle eyes accustomed to the awful presences of thrones and principalities from on high. The lowliness of her station served, as in the case of the Apostles, to accentuate the miraculous character of her mission, by the contrast between the greatness of the work accomplished, and the feebleness of the instrument employed. Unlettered, knowing, as she herself said, "Neither A nor B," undistinguished in the simple frankness of her address and bearing, from thousands

of other village girls of her age and condition, with no external indication of the sublime destiny awaiting her, she blazed upon the world in her double part of warrior and prophetess, sibyl and saint, unheralded and unexpected as a heaven born meteor in a midnight sky. Her career, the most striking manifestation of the supernatural in modern history, is at once the despair of rationalism and the glory of religion, which honours in her a type of sanctity unexampled even among the endless variety of patterns held up for our example. And while on the one hand she recalls by her exploits the heroines of the Jewish dispensation, she is raised far above them on the other by the tender graces of Christian maidenhood, and the supreme consecration of the martyr's death.

A flood of light has been thrown on the career of Joan of Arc since the publication from 1841 to 1849 of the five massive volumes in which Quicherat edited for the *Société de l'Histoire de France* the Latin texts of the two processes of the Condemnation and Rehabilitation of the maid. We published in these pages in January 1891 an article by Father Wyndham, since embodied in the book among our headings, which gave an admirable *résumé* of the most recent writings on the subject down to that date, but the progress of events since then leaves room for much to be added by way of supplement to his essay. The introduction of the cause of the beatification and canonisation of Joan of Arc by the Congregation of Rites, bearing date January 27, 1894, had not then been decreed, giving, as it does, the preliminary imprimatur of the Church to the general belief in her sanctity by the title of Venerable it confers upon her. Only in the same year, too, was added perhaps the most important contribution to the literature of the subject by the publication of the second volume of Père Ayrole's monumental work on "La Vraie Jeanne d'Arc," entitled "La Paysanne et l'Inspirée, d'après ses aveux, les témoins oculaires, et la Libre Pensée." In this division of the work, which will require three more such volumes to complete it, the learned Jesuit gives us the most authoritative picture of Joan's early life yet published, placing her in the midst of the surroundings in which she lived, by reproducing for us in the chapters forming the first book the conditions of the Church of France, and of the native province and village of the Pucelle at the date of her

birth and subsequent years. While these details are found in the general history of the time, those of the personal life of his heroine are drawn almost exclusively from the records of the trials of Condemnation and Rehabilitation in which her career was examined with such opposite results. Her own answers during a prolonged and severe cross-examination by her judges form the material of inestimable value for posterity furnished by the first, while from the second are taken the depositions of thirty-four witnesses who had seen and known her during the first seventeen years of her life, recorded by a Pontifical Commission, which sat at Domrémy, at Vaucouleurs, and at Toul, twenty-five years after her execution. The very persecution of which Joan was the victim has thus been the means of transmitting to posterity a more detailed picture of her life and character than is preserved to us of any historical personage removed from us by so long an interval of time. We are enabled by this evidence to reconstruct for ourselves the everyday life and doings of the little village by the Meuse on which so fierce a light of fame has been shed, and to set in the midst of it her who shared its humble toils while in daily intercourse with the angels and saints of heaven.

Born on the night of the Epiphany in the year 1412, in the lowliest condition of life—if her parents were not indeed actual serfs, as the patent subsequently conferring nobility on her family gives some reason to believe—Joan came into the world when the Church was still distracted by the great schism, healed not quite six years later by the election of Martin V. Its effects in loosening the bonds of ecclesiastical discipline and undermining religious belief were felt long after, and doubtless prepared the way for the Lutheran revolt of the following century. In France the authority of the Pope was weakened by the concessions extorted by Gallicanism during that troublous period, when three rival pretenders to the Papacy claimed the allegiance of the faithful, and the great Orders of St. Francis and St. Dominic were each split into two sections under superiors deriving their authority from the one or the other.

The disorders of the Church were reflected in those of civil society. The hostility of the two factions which convulsed France was exasperated into a blood feud by the successive

assassinations of the chiefs of both, while the English invader profited by these dissensions, and found an ally in one of the contending parties. To the miseries incident to civil war were added those inflicted by unlicensed marauders of all degrees, who took advantage of the prevailing anarchy to imitate the excesses of the bands of adventurers composing the regular armies. Every refinement of cruelty was practised on the unfortunate peasantry by these brigands. So great were their numbers that 10,000 were executed in Normandy alone in a single year, in addition to those hunted down as vermin in consideration of the price put on their heads. One chronicler tells us that from the Loire to the Seine, and from the Seine to the Somme, the cultivators having been slain or dispersed, the fields remained fallow, and the land without inhabitants. He had, he says, seen with his own eyes whole tracts of France—the vast plains of Champagne, the districts of Beauce, Maine, Perche and others, the French and Norman Vexin, the country of Caux from the Seine to Amiens and Abbeville, of Valois as far as Laon, and beyond it towards Hainault, “changed into deserts, uncultivated and fallow, without arms to plough them, covered with bush and brushwood. In most of these lands, where vegetation is most vigorous, I have seen shrubs growing so as to form tangled forests.”

The ground, he goes on to say, was only cultivated in the neighbourhood of towns, and of castles or fortified places, whence a sentinel could from some lofty tower descry the approach of bands of marauders, and give warning of it by the tolling of a bell or blast of a horn. All rushed from the fields to take refuge in a place of safety at the sound of the signal, which he declares was so familiar, that the very animals obeyed it of their own accord. Whole villages were depopulated and reduced to heaps of ruins, so that in one which had sheltered three thousand inhabitants, but seven remained. The capital itself was scarcely better off, and the journal of the *Faux Bourgeois* declares that wolves roamed at large through the streets, so that three or four were sometimes killed in a single night, to be afterwards carried through Paris hanging by their hind paws. The massacres perpetrated by the Burgundians on June 12 and 13, 1418, after they had been admitted by

treachery through one of the gates of the city, were a curious anticipation of those of the terrible days of September 1793. The prisons, as on that occasion, were broken open, and their inmates massacred indiscriminately, not only those of the opposite party, but all detained there for any reason. The streets ran red with blood, and the number of victims is estimated at from 1600 to 2000, the Bishops of Saintes, of Senlis, of Constance, Bayeux, and Evreux, being included in the number. It was as the ally of this party, which then included the mad King, Charles VI. and his Queen Isabeau, that the English conqueror, Henry V., entered Paris in 1420, having, by his victory of Agincourt five years before, rendered himself master of northern France, while by the treaty of Troyes, on his marriage with Katharine of France he had been declared heir after his father-in-law to the entire kingdom. The latter having survived him by two months, his infant son, Henry VI., inherited his claim, and was proclaimed King of France, of which his uncle, the Duke of Bedford, assumed the regency. A series of crushing defeats inflicted on the troops of the rival claimant, the Dauphin, now Charles VII., at Cravant, on July 31, 1423, Verneuil, on August 17, 1424, and Rouvray, on February 12, 1429, had wrested from him all his dominions beyond the Loire, with the sole exception of the fortress-sanctuary of Mont-St.-Michel in Normandy.

It was during the accomplishment of these disastrous events that the obscure peasant child of Domrémy was growing up to play so unexpected a part in the strife of captains and kings. Her native village then formed an *enclave* of French territory on the borders of the Empire, being almost surrounded by the territories of the Dukes of Bar and Lorraine, owing allegiance principally to the latter. Prophecy and tradition associated the spot with the appearance of a maiden deliverer of France, for Merlin had foretold, that from the bois chenu in the immediate neighbourhood of the hamlet "sortira une Pucelle qui apportera remède aux blessures," and Joan herself, though in her early life ignorant of this prediction, referred to another when urging the necessity of her journey to the Dauphin, in the following terms: "Do you not know that it has been prophesied that France should be lost by a woman, and raised up by a Virgin from the Marches of Lorraine?"

Her contemporaries, however, were far from connecting these ancient sayings with the little daughter of the poor peasants, Jacques d'Arc and Isabel Romée, who grew up in their midst undistinguished from her young companions save by her great though unostentatious piety. The *Pater*, *Ave*, and *Credo*, learned at her mother's knee, seem to have constituted her sole theological repertory, nor is there a record of her having been taught catechism or any regular summary of Christian doctrine. On the other hand she went frequently to confession, heard Mass whenever possible, and knelt in the fields as often as she heard the bell rung for any public practice of devotion. In the church she was a model of recollection, kneeling with her eyes fixed on the crucifix, or the image of our Lady, for which she loved to twine garlands of leaves or flowers when in the woods with her companions. To the sylvan sanctuary of Bermont, within a few miles of her home, she had a particular devotion, and made frequent Saturday pilgrimages to the shrine of our Lady there, in company with her sister and others. One of her companions, in her deposition twenty-five years after her death, declares that she was so good, simple, and pious, that she and the other girls often reproached her with being too devout, and a boy-playmate gives similar evidence :

I often saw Jeannette la Pucelle [he says]. In my young days I went with her leading her father's plough. I was with her in the pastures and fields with the other girls. Often while we were amusing ourselves together, Jeanne retired apart, and it seemed to me that she conversed with God. I and the others laughed at her.

No less charitable than devout, she not only gave what small alms she could, but often surrendered her own bed to wayfarers, sleeping, the witnesses say, in the oven, probably a sunken chamber heated for baking, such as was formerly attached to many houses. Perrin le Drapier testifies that when he was attached to the service of the church of Domrémy, Joan often reproached him for neglecting to ring for compline, and used to make him presents of wool on condition of his being more diligent in his office.

But the little maiden, so far from being dreamy or abstracted, is described by all the witnesses as most industrious in all household tasks, in spinning, and in tending her father's pigs

and poultry. As it was the custom for all the inhabitants to take turns in the care of the village flocks, Joan took her share of the duty on behalf of her father, being only in this partial sense a shepherdess. Her pride in her domestic accomplishments was shown in her naïve boast during the course of her trial, that in the use of the needle and distaff she did not fear the competition of any woman in Rouen.

The harmless survival of an ancient superstition among the peasantry of the Valley of the Meuse was wrested by her judges into the foundation of the charge of witchcraft, one of the chief of those on which she was condemned. Within a mile of Domrémy, on the road to Neufchâteau, was an ancient and spreading beech tree, known as *l'Arbre des Dames*, or *des Fées*, which had a legendary reputation as a favourite haunt and meeting place of "the women or ladies called fairies," though all the witnesses were agreed in declaring that they had never seen one, or known any one who had. Various reasons were assigned for their disappearance, one octogenarian ascribing it to the sins of the people, while others attributed it to the reading of the Gospel under the tree by the priest, when the cross was carried through the fields on Ascension Eve. The custom, however, survived for the boys and girls of the village, accompanied sometimes by the châtelaines of the neighbouring castle, to repair thither on the Sunday after mid-Lent, called *Laetare* from the opening words of the Mass, to dance and play under the tree, and drink from an adjacent fountain, while eating small loaves of bread brought with them on this gipsy feast. They did the same in the spring and in the month of May, when they sometimes made a "May man," probably what is in this country still called a "Jack in the Green." That Joan sometimes took part in this innocent recreation, though only, as some witnesses averred, in order not to appear singular, was made by her accusers ground for charging her with holding intercourse there with evil spirits. All the witnesses for her rehabilitation were therefore examined at great length on the subject, but were unanimous in deposing that she never went there alone or under any other circumstances than the above.

Another incident of her girlhood, about which a tissue of calumnious fable has been woven, was the flight to Neufchâteau

of all the villagers of Domrémy, when their homes were threatened by the approach of a band of marauders. That she went and returned in the company of her parents, and dwelt while there in the house occupied by them and many of their neighbours, was sworn to unanimously by all those examined on the subject, but this clear and direct testimony did not prevent the false version of the same incident from being repeated by many historians and made the basis of Voltaire's infamous drama. According to this travesty of the truth, she lived there as a servant in a low inn, frequented by soldiers and disorderly characters, acquiring her military tastes in this society, and her equestrian prowess by riding the horses to water. The culminating point of the tale was her suit against a young man for non-fulfilment of a promise of marriage, from which he obtained his release by pleading the bad company she had kept.

There is a conflict of opinion as to the date of this controverted occurrence, but Père Ayroles shows grounds for believing it to have taken place in 1425, when Joan was thirteen. The learned Jesuit identifies it, with every appearance of probability, with a raid on Domrémy by a celebrated marauder, Henri d'Olry, established by independent historical evidence as having occurred in that year. This freebooter carried off all the flocks and herds of the village with whatever other booty he could lay his hands on, but had a short-lived success, as the Dame d'Ogéwillers, into whose possession the domain of Domrémy had passed, made application, on the complaint of her vassals, to her powerful cousin, the Sire de Joinville, who sent his men-at-arms in pursuit of the raiders, and compelled them to disgorge their prey.

The story of Joan's girlhood closes with the episode of her citation before the Ecclesiastical Court of Toul by a young man who pretended to have received the promise of her hand, but whom she compelled, by the force of her eloquence, publicly to confess the falsity of his allegations. This pretended betrothal is supposed to have been a stratagem of her father's to withhold her from her mission, and was referred to by herself in her trial at Rouen, when she declared that she had always been obedient to her parents, except in the matter of the marriage at Toul.

Such were the simple and authentic details of the external life of the peasant maiden of Domrémy, detached from the

fabric of imaginary amplification and false interpretation that modern commentators have reared upon them. But to this apparently commonplace existence, differing in no wise from that of hundreds of girls of her age and time, there was a mysterious side unseen by the rest of the world. Joan was in her thirteenth year, when there began for her that double life, so strangely interwoven with her ordinary avocations, and forming the divinely appointed course of preparation for her sublime destiny. Its particulars would never have been known except for the malice of her persecutors, whose attempt to cover her with shame has but enhanced her glory. Derived entirely from her own avowals wrung from her under cross-examination, and thus registered as part of the proceedings of a judicial tribunal, they form, perhaps, the most wonderful record of spiritual experiences anywhere handed down to us. Those favoured with such communications are generally reluctant to speak of them, and Joan only did so when necessary for the explanation of her mission, or for her defence and justification in the course of her trial. During the years at Domrémy, she observed absolute silence on the subject, unless in so far as she may have confided in her confessor, although secrecy, as she has stated, was not enjoined on her. It must be borne in mind, as regards the credibility of statements so amazing, that they were authenticated by prodigies more amazing still, by the punctual fulfilment of her prophecies, no less then by her performance of a task impossible to unassisted human means.

Her supernatural life began when she was in her thirteenth year, in the summer of 1424, probably on May 31st, the vigil of the Ascension. In her father's garden, which adjoined the cemetery and church, towards midday, but before she had broken her fast, there appeared to her, as to the shepherds of Bethlehem, a great light and a number of angels, the chief of whom, as she afterwards knew, was St. Michael. This apparition, which she always speaks of as a voice, though she saw as well as heard, terrified her at first, she being then but a young child, but when she had heard it three times, she knew it was the voice of an angel. It admonished her to behave herself well and frequent the church, and told her "of the great pity of the Kingdom of France," showing her, as we may suppose, the grievous misfortunes and woes, of which a faint

picture has been given above. The voice continued two or three times a week to bid her leave her own country and go into France, so that, as she says, she

Could no longer endure the place in which she was abiding. The voice told me (she says) that I should raise the siege that had been laid to the town of Orleans; it afterwards bade me go to Robert de Baudricourt in the fortress of Vaucouleurs, of which he was the captain, and that he would give me people to conduct me. I replied to it, "I am a poor girl who does not know how to ride, and I do not understand war."

St. Michael, she said elsewhere, had taught and shown her many things, but it was not permitted to her to tell all that he had revealed to her.

But though the "Angel of Peril," as he is called in Brittany, never ceased to appear to her at intervals, he deputed Saints Catherine of Alexandria and Margaret of Antioch to be her more familiar and constant counsellors. The archangel himself prepared her for their coming, according to her own statement as follows:

When St. Michael came to me, he told me that St. Catherine and St. Margaret would come. He desired me to act according to their counsels, that they were ordered to direct and advise me in what I had to do, that I should believe what they told me, for such was the command of our Lord.

These saints appeared to her thenceforward under an invariable form, wearing very rich crowns of great price, though as to the remainder of their attire, she either could not or would not speak. They were as real to her, she declared, as any of the human beings about her, and she not only saw, but touched them, embracing their knees and feet with great reverence and devotion. When they departed from her she often wept, and longed to accompany them. They guided her conduct in the most minute particulars, and sometimes one and sometimes the other desired her to go to confession, even when she was not conscious of being in mortal sin. For the last seven years of her life she lived in constant communion with these celestial visitors, who sometimes came spontaneously, and sometimes in answer to her earnest prayer that they might be sent to her assistance. Once, indeed, she disobeyed them, when through impatience, like Moses when he struck the rock a second time, she jumped from the tower of Beaurevoir, where she was

hemmed in by the enemy, in order to come to the assistance of Compiègne then threatened. The saints, she says, seeing the great necessity she was under, came to her help and saved her life, but desired her to go to confession after this transgression.

During her trial and imprisonment she appealed constantly to her voices for help and counsel, and received it several times a day. She sorely needed their consoling presence during that cruel imprisonment when she was cut off from all the external solaces of religion, and guarded by brutal soldiers night and day. A final triumph was promised to her, but in terms so vague as to leave her doubtful of the manner of her deliverance.

St. Catherine has told me that I should have help (she said to her judges). I do not know whether it will be by being delivered out of prison, or that when I am brought up for judgment some trouble will arise by which I shall be released. I think it will be one or other. Most frequently the voices say to me that I shall be delivered by a great victory; and they say to me afterwards: "Accept all willingly; do not be uneasy about your martyrdom; you shall come at last into the kingdom of Paradise." The voices say that to me simply, absolutely—that is to say, without fail. I call this martyrdom the great pain and adversity I suffer in prison. I do not know whether I shall suffer still greater, but I leave it to our Lord.

Thus they predicted her end clearly, but allowed her to put her own interpretation on their words, as we may believe in mercy in order to spare her the tortures of anticipation. In the same way, when she asked them whether she should be burned, they gave no direct reply, but desired her to leave all to our Lord and that He would help her. They had foretold her capture at Compiègne, as she described in the following answer.

During last Easter week, when I was in the ditches of Méhun, it was said to me by my voices—that is to say, St. Catherine and St. Margaret—that I should be taken before St. John's Day; that this must be, and not to let myself be cast down, but to accept all cheerfully and that God would help me.

And to the further question as to whether the prediction had been repeated later, she answered:

They have said it to me several times, so to say every day. I begged of them that when I should be taken I might die quickly without

long travail in prison, and they said to me to accept all cheerfully, for thus it must be, but they did not tell me the hour. Several times I have asked to know the hour, but they did not tell me.

Thus the curtain of the future was only partially lifted for her, and she was not permitted a foreknowledge that might have overborne even her lofty spirit.

The three supernal visitants who fulfilled the office of her special counsellors were not the only members of the court of heaven whom she was privileged to see. St. Gabriel is mentioned as having appeared to her at least once, and in another part of her evidence she says she had "often seen angels amongst Christians." Her eyes were opened to perceive the invisible presences hidden from the grosser sense of ordinary mortals though never absent from their midst.

One of the most interesting of the contemporary accounts of the maid is contained in a letter written by de Boulainvilliers, Councillor and Chamberlain of Charles VII., to Filippo Maria Visconti, Duke of Milan, when she was at the zenith of her career. Her visions are here described as consisting of a luminous cloud, whence a voice issued; and from her habitually speaking of her monitors as voices, we may assume as probable that this was their ordinary form, while the visible apparitions were exceptional. She declares in her evidence, by way of explanation, that when she used the word voice, she also meant the light which accompanied it, saying that she rarely heard it without seeing the light, that there was a great deal of light on all sides, and that all the light did not extend to her. This phrase doubtless means that it did not surround or envelop her, but was seen externally to her own position. We have thus as clear an idea as can be gathered of phenomena so entirely without the range of ordinary experience, of the mysterious communications by which Joan was, during the five years previous to her public appearance, prepared and fortified for her extraordinary mission.

To explain away the supernatural character of the latter, while assigning to the heroine her undoubted place in the national history, has been a difficult task for the modern school of rationalism, with Michelet at its head. Joan's contemporary enemies simplified it by treating her as a sorceress whose visions and inspiration were of the other world indeed, but

from below, instead of from above. Joan was condemned and executed as a witch by a court of French ecclesiastics, under the influence of the University of Paris, and in the interests of the Anglo-Burgundian party. Her detractors in our day are satisfied with proclaiming her a life-long monomaniac, the victim of hallucinations produced on an overwrought brain by the political convulsions of the time. Cases of similar delusions abound, indeed, in lunatic asylums, as the self-importance of their inmates seeks gratification in the fancied assumption of spiritual exaltation or divine inspiration. There is only this one cardinal point of difference between such patients and the regeneratress of France, that they do not perform the prodigies they announce, or justify their pretensions to celestial aid by the execution of designs impossible to unaided earthly powers. The signs and wonders wrought by the maid were the convincing proofs of the genuineness of her mission, and the one set of phenomena is only explicable in the light of the other. These proofs were of a twofold character, consisting of prophecy and the fulfilment of prophecy in the accomplishment of the events foretold. Her earliest recorded utterance as to her own future was spoken to one of her boy companions, who, in his testimony in the process of rehabilitation, declared that she had once told him on the eve of St. John that "there was a young girl between Coussey and Vaucouleurs (two points on either side of Domrémy) who would cause the King of France to be anointed within the year." In point of fact, he added, the King was crowned at Rheims the following year. Her mission had, however, already been proclaimed in general terms, as her first appeal to Robert de Baudricourt, captain of Vaucouleurs, for an escort to convey her to the Dauphin had been made about the time of the Feast of the Ascension previous. On October 12, in the same year 1428, had begun the memorable siege of Orleans, the crisis of the most tragic period of French history.

De Baudricourt having twice repulsed Joan's solicitations, contemptuously bidding her friends take her home and box her well, she backed her third appeal to him on February 12, 1429, by the announcement of the crushing defeat of Rouvray, which took place on that day at a distance of 100 leagues from the scene of the conversation. By this sign she finally

vanquished the resistance of the stout soldier, who had doubtless previously thought, like M. Michelet, that he was dealing with one demented. As soon as sufficient time had elapsed for the fact to be certified—viz., in nine days after, she was on her way to the Dauphin, with the red dress she had worn on her arrival exchanged for a suit of male attire, assumed in obedience to the instructions of her supernatural counsellors. The way, she declared, was open before her, although it lay for 150 leagues through the enemy's country, and so in fact it proved. She reached the royal headquarters at the castle of Chinon in Touraine without impediment, travelling principally by night during the eleven days that she was on the road. Here she was subjected to a fresh test before being admitted to see the King, termed by her Dauphin, until after his consecration and coronation. Pronounced irreproachable by a committee of learned divines, at whose hands she underwent a most rigorous examination during six weeks, she was at last admitted to the royal presence, and identified the King in the midst of the circle, although he sought to embarrass her by pointing out another as himself. His doubts and hesitations were put to flight by her proof of miraculous knowledge of his most intimate thoughts in a reference to a secret known only to himself and heaven. It is believed, although there is no certain evidence on the point, to have been a painful doubt as to his birth, long the subject of his earnest prayers, which she was divinely permitted to clear up by the words in which she addressed him.

I tell thee on the part of my Lord (she is reported to have said) that thou art true heir of France and son of the King, and He sends me to thee to lead thee to Rheims, that there thou mayest receive thy coronation and consecration if thou wilt.

His face was seen "inundated with a great joy" on receipt of her communication, and from that moment he accepted her mission.

To her examiners at Poitiers she had declared that she would show a sign before Orleans, for such was the Divine will. This she did as soon as a force was placed at her disposal, first by leading a convoy of provisions into the town, in full sight of the besiegers, who looked on as if spell-bound, and then by the series of brilliant sallies, in which, as she

had repeatedly promised, she defeated and shattered their forces, compelling them to raise the siege on May 8, 1429.

The second great sign of her mission, the coronation of the King at Rheims, was accomplished in the face of difficulties that rendered it humanly speaking impossible, the intervening country with a number of strongly fortified towns being in the hands of the enemy. Yet her march through it resembled a triumphal progress, many of the towns opening their gates on the appearance of the royal army, and the ceremony was performed on July 17, in less than three months from the time when she first assumed command. Among other predictions recorded of her, was the recommendation to make all possible use of her, as she would "only last a year." This was almost literally fulfilled, as her capture at Compiègne, on May 24, 1430, was within thirteen months of her first feat of arms, the revictualling of Orleans on April 29 of the previous year. In the course of her trial she made several prophecies, registered by her enemies themselves, such as the total expulsion of the English and reconquest of the entire kingdom, the peace of Arras and recovery of Paris before seven years. Even the sword habitually used by her, as a symbol only, not an implement of slaughter, for she shed no blood with her own hands, was a testimony to her supernatural gifts, as it was found buried at a great depth behind the altar of the church of St. Catherine of Fierbois, where it was sought in obedience to her directions.

The theory of modern historians that Joan's direct mission ended with the coronation at Rheims, and that her continuance in command was an arbitrary extension of her celestial mandate, is shown by Father Wyndham to be a conclusion unauthorized by contemporary records. It is true that intrigues and counter-influences, paralysed in the first joy of a great deliverance, began thenceforward to reassert themselves, and that her authority ceased to be accepted with unquestioning docility by leaders to whom the triumphs of the girl-warrior were a reproach. The sternness, too, with which she repressed the license of the camp, must have rendered her rule distasteful to the rude soldiery accustomed to make war the pretext and apology for all excesses. Some consciousness of waning authority is betrayed in one of her answers to her

judges, in which she declared that had she lasted three years "without obstacle" she would have delivered the Duke of Orleans, and presumably accomplished the remainder of her task of expelling the English from her native soil. But that she had personally ceased to be guided and inspired by heaven throughout the second, as well as the first phase of her career, is a gratuitous assumption of modern criticism.

It is a curious fact that Joan is most commonly known to posterity by names she never bore in her lifetime. When asked at the opening of her trial what her surname was, she replied that her father's was d'Arc, and her mother's Romée, and that the girls in her country usually were called by that of their mother. She, however, throughout her life, never styled herself, or was styled by others save as Jeanne la Pucelle, by which title she was addressed by her celestial monitors, frequently with the addition of "Fille de Dieu." Thus to her contemporaries she was the Maid *par excellence*, the distinctive "of Orleans" having been added by later times. It has, however, been adopted in the decree concerning her beatification, in which she is styled "The Venerable Servant of God, Joan of Arc, Virgin, called 'The Maid of Orleans.'" If, as we may hope, her cause proceeds through its further stages to her canonisation, it will be by the name of St. Joan of Arc that she will be raised to the honours of the altars.

It may be permissible to speculate why, on behalf of France among all countries that have suffered similar miseries, so violent a deviation should have been made from the ordinary laws guiding human events, why a miraculous deliverance should have been wrought by the visible intervention of heaven in favour of a particular people not more deserving apparently than many others of such special care.

A possible answer to the question may be found in the history of the subsequent century, when the tenets of the Reformation, had the two countries remained under a single rule, might have been forced upon France by the same violent means used by Henry VIII. and his successors to compel their acceptance by England. The former was thus preserved by the instrumentality of the maid from a moral disaster incomparably greater than all the material woes from which she was delivered by the same means, while the Catholic Church was spared a

secession which would have been almost equivalent to the extinction of its authority in Europe. Joan, looked at in this light, was the champion not of her own country alone, but of the spiritual kingdom of the universe, prepared from her earliest youth for that exalted mission by the direct ministry of the angels and saints of heaven. And as the armed maiden, heroic in suffering as in war, she was the most perfect type of that Church militant whose battle she fought during her short life on earth.

We cannot read the story of Joan of Arc without being struck with the analogy it presents on many points, with the other mysterious supernatural manifestation of which France has in our own time been chosen as the scene. The visions that have made the Pyrenean sanctuary a place of pilgrimage for all nations, though directed to a different end, have many features in common with those which have consecrated the little village by the Meuse to their sublime memories. Bernadette, like Joan, was an uncultured peasant child, in no way distinguished from thousands of her class, when she, like Joan, was chosen as the instrument of a marvellous revelation. She, too, in her simplicity, did not at first sight recognise the transcendent majesty of the supernal apparition, and was in similar fashion schooled by a series of communications, in the nature of the message she was to deliver to the world. Nor was there, in either case, any such suspension of the natural faculties as produces the state of ecstasy or trance, for Bernadette, while gazing on her vision, could describe it in detail to the companions around her, and Joan's playfellows told at the end of years how sometimes in their sports she would withdraw apart and seem as though communing with heaven, though evidently not wrapt from ordinary consciousness. Both Joan and Bernadette were in all matters external to their respective missions, of absolute simplicity of manners and undowered with any exceptional faculties, though gifted within the range of the duties imposed on them, with wisdom that baffled all the devices of human intelligence to thwart or entrap it. Fidelity to their appointed tasks was the distinguishing characteristic of each, for as the terrors of death itself could not bring the shepherdess of the Meuse to gainsay the genuineness of her inspiration, so the

cross-examination of the keenest wits in France failed to elicit from her of the Gave, during the eight years that she remained to answer all the inquiries of the curious and sceptical, a single word in contradiction of the wonderful tale recited by her with such unvarying precision. The little witness of Our Lady was no less faithful to her vocation than the disciple of the Archangel to her more strenuous call.

To the latter it was given to smite with the sword of heaven the armed invaders encamped on the soil of ancient France.

The child of Lourdes was summoned from her simple rural tasks to do battle against a subtler enemy in a holier cause. It was Bernadette Soubiron's part to uphold the standard of Our Lady in the war waged at the present day by gross materialism against supernatural belief, which has inflicted on modern France evils far transcending those from which Joan of Arc was four and a half centuries ago divinely commissioned to deliver her.

ELLEN M. CLERKE.

ART. V.—THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE: THE TWO STAGES OF THEIR INTER- RELATION.

THE Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, addressed by the Holy Father last December to the Bishops throughout the Catholic world, with a view to reorganising the study of Scripture chiefly in the seminaries, and reaffirming the Church's traditional teaching respecting the Divine Authorship, Plenary Inspiration and Inerrancy of Holy Writ, has drawn renewed attention to a subject which anyhow, here in England, is always and increasingly with us—the complicated, difficult, unavoidable subject of the Bible, of the Bible and the Church, of the Bible in the Church. It is obvious, however, that not even the Encyclical itself, with all its range and authority, could enter, or indeed intend to enter, into all the many important previous, and permanent, and secondary questions, assumptions and applications which its own principles open out. And so much of this Bible question is a mixed one—is so much one for scholars and historians as well as theologians—that it may perhaps not ill-become me, all lay-student though I be, if, with a careful attention to the Encyclical throughout, I attempt some account of the specifically Catholic conception of the Bible, and as to how and where within the Catholic system I conceive we ought to locate the different branches of Biblical research.* I will do my best to give, theologically, but the common or at least approved teaching; and critically, but such conclusions as would appear to be reasonably certain, and as have already gained appreciable Catholic support. I hope to succeed in helping on these important questions which have engaged my close attention for many a year, by simply exhibiting, in due sequence and proportion, facts and principles generally

* I have striven hard nowhere to exceed the bounds of a loyal interpretation of a document which, especially in its doctrinal portions, claims the docility and obedience of us all. And this especially in view of the attacks, in part unmeasured and unmannerly, which the Encyclical's transparent love of Scripture and of souls ought surely to have moderated.

admitted, but often only piecemeal, and without due attention to inter-relation and relative importance. I am profoundly convinced that it is only in a duly proportioned and consistent adherence to Catholic principles and analogies—the Catholic system, the whole Catholic system, and nothing but the Catholic system—that a satisfactory solution of the difficulties of the subject will be found. Hence I would propose that each step and stage of the inquiry be read in the light of all the others, and that the whole be taken but as so much material for the criticism and judgment of the Catholic Church.

As the basis of the two following articles, I propose to show first, how all human apprehension of things both human and divine, whether in the form of Faith or of Reason, ever must and does grow and move on towards comprehension without ever reaching it; and next, that Reason, which necessarily begins with assumptions, as necessarily ends in Faith, and that both Faith and Reason begin and end with moral dispositions and moral acts and truths. I will go on to show that the apprehensions of Faith, ever growing by development of doctrine, and the apprehensions of Reason, ever growing by the accumulation of its materials and the perfecting of its methods, have in Biblical, as in other theological sciences, each a large domain already mapped out for the characteristic activities of each; and this, by the very necessities and obligations of the Catholic position. For that, though man's very Creation would seem to involve Revelation, indeed the Incarnation, and the latter to necessarily involve its extension—the Church; yet neither Revelation nor the Incarnation nor the Church necessarily involve the Bible as such, but only as containing certain documents of human authority. Now this human authority has to be established by human, historical means and methods—our first stage. The free act of Faith, acting, under the illumination and impulsion of grace, upon this and other cumulative evidence, brings us to the divine authority of the Church. And by the Church alone we are then conclusively taught the existence, nature, and range of the divine authority of the Bible—certain truths and facts above and additional to the legitimate operations and conclusions of Reason. For at this, our second stage, Reason is still busy—busy with that local and temporal adaptation of

the divine Message, which Faith agrees with Reason in finding throughout the Bible, whilst Faith alone can with certainty everywhere find and define the divine Message itself.

At each stage there is Faith: in the first, pure Theism; in the second, Catholicism. At each stage there is Reason: in the first, leading up to Faith; in the second, transcended by it. At each stage as elsewhere Faith remains Faith and grows, Reason remains Reason and grows too. They are Mary and Martha involving, stimulating, supplementing one another.

The first two articles will consider the Bible *quâ* human document, previous to belief in the Church; the third will consider it *quâ* divine library, received as such from the hands of the Church.

I.

1. I begin with our highest doctrine, pushed to its legitimate limit, and that not on the part of the modern mind, so liable to extremes of all kinds, but on the part of the traditional teaching of our theologians—based upon the clearest utterances of Scripture, the Fathers, and Reason, and contained in every manual of theology: I mean the incomprehensibility and ineffableness of God for all but Himself, both here and hereafter.

Dr. M. Scheeben, in his highly authorised “Dogmatik” (Freiburg, 1873s.), tells us, vol. i. p. 571, how that the doctrine that “God is, for all beings beside Himself, absolutely unfathomable and incomprehensible, and this even supernaturally and in the immediate vision of God, is *de fide*.” Specially in consequence of the profession of Faith *Firmiter* of the fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215) in which God is declared *incomprehensibilis* as absolutely as *immense* and *omnipotent*; repeated by the Vatican Council, sess. 3, c. i. And further that “the expression *incomprehensibilis* has at all times been so uniformly understood in this absolute sense, as to render the apparent exception of single theologians, such as Thomassin, in favour of the soul of Christ very suspect, and, in any case, to but strengthen the rule for all mere creatures.” And, on p. 573, he tells us that “God is inexpressible first in this sense that the knowledge to be expressed is never and nowhere an exhaustive one, and all the more for man in this life, the further his knowledge of God is removed from—we will not say an exhaustive knowledge, but even from one which in its degree would give Him as He is in Himself”; and that this is *de fide*. And that, secondly, “God is inexpressible also in this sense that the finite mind is incapable, whether with or without signs, of giving such an expression to the highest knowledge of God of which it is

capable, *i.e.*, the intuitive, as to be capable of imparting it to other minds"; and that this is as certain as God's invisibleness. And that, thirdly, "it is highly probable that God is ineffable also in this sense, that the blessed in the direct vision of His essence are incapable of giving internal expression, even for themselves alone, to their knowledge, a thing possible and natural in the case of all other acts of cognition. According to this view God appears ineffable to the point of being incapable of being expressed as He is in Himself, we will not say adequately, but at all. This is the doctrine of many of the older Thomists, and again of Borgianelli. It pushes to its extreme consequence the conception that the Infinite is incapable of having a homogeneous representation in the Finite, which would so express and represent the Infinite as it is in itself. And, again, it insists that the mind, in the vision of God, is so borne by God and sunk in Him, that it is incapable of enclosing and expressing its vision by an idea—in a manner similar though not identical to that in which the soul, even here below, becomes speechless when face to face with some overwhelming spectacle, and, entirely absorbed by the impression, is incapable of so mastering what it sees as to strive or even be able to fix it in definite ideas."

Identical teaching will be found in the Jesuit Fr. Hurter's "*Theologiæ Dogmaticæ Compendium*," ed. 1893, vol. ii. pp. 14-20. He tells us how Thomassin, the great French seventeenth century Oratorian, in his "*De Deo*," vi. 19, "inculcates well, with regard to this complex question, that we ought to be mindful that the very incomprehensibleness of God is itself incomprehensible." He quotes St. Augustine, who will have it that God is even more ineffable than He is incomprehensible, and who says ("*De Trinit.*," vii. 4): "God is more truly thought than He is expressed, and He more truly *is* than He is thought"; and St. Gregory the Great, who writes ("*Mor.*," l. 20, c. 32, n. 62): "Well-nigh all indeed that is said of God is already unworthy of Him for the very reason that it could be said."

And next I would point out that it is just this absolute incomprehensibility which gives room for a continuous apprehension on and on, ever fresh and ever new, of the one inexhaustible God; and this, not only here but even, indeed still more hereafter.

As Leibniz has it : *

Our supreme felicity (by whatever beatific vision or knowledge of God it be accompanied) can never be full, because God being infinite, He can never be entirely known. Hence our happiness will never consist in an exhaustive enjoyment in which there would be nothing left to desire and which would stupify our mind, but in a perpetual progress to new pleasures and to new perfections.

* "*Philosophische Schriften*," ed. Gerhardt, v. vi. p. 606.

Scripture gives us both aspects when, in Ecclesiasticus, ch. xxiv., v. 29, it tells us: "They that drink me, shall yet thirst," and, in St. John, ch. iv. v. 13, it gives our Lord's words: "He that shall drink of the water that I will give him, shall not thirst for ever." Or as St. Irenæus says: *

Among the things we find in Scripture—since all Scripture is spiritual—some things indeed we understand according to the grace of God, but other things are left to the knowledge of God; and this not only in this life, but also in the world to come, so that God may teach for ever, and man may throughout learn from God. . . . For Faith in our Teacher endures firm for ever . . . so that we may love Him truly for ever, because He alone is the Father; and may hope continually to receive more and to learn from God, because He is good and possesses unlimited riches, a Kingdom without end, and a teaching which is immeasurable.

And Dr. Hettinger† adds well:

In the life of time, the contrasts of activity and rest, of desire and possession are separate; here they are conjoined: the Blessed are ever desiring, ever receiving, ever striving, ever possessing; they ever *are* blessed and ever becoming blessed.

And finally, whilst holding with all philosophers that acts of the understanding are the necessary antecedents and condition of acts of the will, and with all theologians that one of the essential constituents of the soul's action and joy in heaven, its vision, is intellectual—I would take sides with the Scotists and the many other highly authorised theologians who make the soul's culminating action and happiness to consist specifically in acts of the will, of love consequent upon the sight.‡ In this case, the supreme perfection of the creature, which Lessius holds § to consist chiefly in the vision, would be identical with the supreme honour of God, which, according to him, consists chiefly in the love: the soul's supreme perfection and happiness would reside in the will and would be moral. I would say with Bossuet: ||

True and perfect knowledge is a source of love; and, inversely, we know God truly when we love Him: a speculative and simply curious knowledge is not that knowledge in which Christ declares that eternal

* "Adv. Haer.," l. ii. c. 28, n. 3.

† Apologie des christenthums, 1869, ii. 2, p. 284.

‡ See Ripalda, "De Ente Supernaturali," ed. 1666, v. iii. pp. 350, 358, 362.

§ "De Summo Bono," l. ii. c. 6.

|| "Méditations," ii°. p. 27^{ej}.

life consists. The devils know God in this manner, and their knowledge but produces their pride and their condemnation. . . . The more we advance in the knowledge of God, the more we see, as it were, that we know nothing that would be worthy of Him ; and, by transcending all that we have ever thought of Him or could think of Him throughout eternity, we praise Him in his incomprehensible truth ; and we lose ourselves in this praise, and we try to make up by loving for what is wanting to our knowledge.

Yes, an eternal vision ; but one that, if it be *beatific*, if it move to delight, surely first moves to love as well and even more. So would moral acts be rewarded by being given "the glory of going on and still to be" supreme ; so would an indefinitely increased and intuitive and indefectible knowledge but lead to an immense expansion of the powers of love, and the will, and the moral nature, paramount there as here. Christianity, depend upon it, is not a deferred intellectualism, and the order of value and dignity between our faculties—heighten and deepen these faculties as you will—will be preserved by the God Whose grace does not destroy nature but perfects it, and Who has Himself revealed to us that He has made us in His own likeness and that He Himself is Love.

2. Now these three characteristics of the Creator and of our knowledge of Him : incomprehensibility, indefinite apprehensibility, and the supremacy of the ethical, we find them in their degree in all creatures and in our knowledge of them. And as the creature observed or the creature observing rise in the scale of truly living life—in proportion to their approximation to the Creator—in the same proportion does this object of knowledge, and does the knowledge itself participate in those characteristics of the Lord and giver of Life. Conceive of anything as exhaustively comprehensible, or again, as not indefinitely knowable, or finally, as not involving or leading at its best and highest to moral questions and to moral acts, and you have discrowned life and ruined science. Here is the point where Faith and Science are not only supplementary but alike ; here it is that the true temper and implications of Faith can alone discipline the mind's untempered desires and save them from swinging from the comprehension of Hegel back to the agnosticism of Herbert Spencer. Faith alone can keep us moving on and on, and up and up, in constant growth and movement, the will ever transcending the understanding, and

the fuller objects and the supreme object of both will and understanding ever seen and felt to transcend both.

And the history of souls at all times, and of science especially since its new birth at the Renaissance, have ever been but an ever-deepening commentary on these truths. Copernicus, and Galileo and the first telescope, and Kepler, with such dates as 1543, 1610, 1618; the first microscope, with such dates as 1590 and 1621; Geology, with no date of importance earlier than the forties of last century—what a tardy expansion, at first painful, then delightful, do they not represent of our conceptions regarding the most elementary objects of sense which have been above our heads, beneath our feet, in every drop of water, ever since our human race began! And so also with historical method and discovery: the history of the immemorial East, of Greece and of Rome, of the ancient philosophies and heathen religions has greatly gained, even during the last sixty years, in depth and accuracy and range. And so, in its own way, with the spiritual life: a Tauler appears and causes whole audiences to faint away under the intensity of the apprehension he awakens of the circumambient world unseen, so fully believed but so dimly apprehended throughout the life-time of the many; and a St. Catherine of Genoa gives theologians much to do in explaining and finding room for the fresh materials which her close contact with the hidden realities brings to their science. And so, indeed, in its own peculiar fashion and degree, even with doctrine and dogma: there is there a growth and development as remarkable as is the identity of principle and idea and moral personality underlying all. Some such tardy and intermittent awakening, some such startling novelty we shall then be prepared to find in Biblical science also, in so far as it has affinity with the natural and purely historical sciences, and is not occupied with the dogmatic or devotional facts and meaning of the Books; and this development of doctrine and dogma, we shall expect to find in the Bible itself.

3. Now all this, if, normally and in the long run, it but adds to the depth and breadth of our conceptions of even the least constituents of this “wide, wide world,” and, still more, of the world’s great Maker, is also but too capable of, accidentally but frequently, confusing and upsetting the very convictions

which it should but widen and confirm. And yet it is these pre- and trans-scientific convictions which are the very salt of all true life, of the life of science itself, and the true measure of the true depth and dignity of a period. As the largely sceptical Dr. R. Eucken strikingly says of the world of culture characteristic of our time : *

The world of culture shows throughout its entire extent a peculiar contrast, a junction of overflowing riches and painful poverty. Here, brilliant achievements in the scientific and technical conquest of surrounding nature, in the historic reconstruction of all that mankind has ever done or experienced, in the apt organisation of existing forces with a view to common action ; there, complete uncertainty, indeed the lack of all that concerns first principles, comprehensive convictions, creative ideas ; in the former, the present gigantically superior to all previous times, in the latter, poorer, emptier than any epoch within the memory of history.

Less than ever then must we look to the world for life's dynamics ; less than ever should we be dazzled by life's mechanics which are all the world has to give : the former, even alone, are what makes life worth living ; the latter, if alone, are but a brilliant barbarism.

And there is always some danger of our losing the greater by too eagerly seeking after the lesser, because of the strain and cost of keeping intellectual self-control and, with it, that " Faith which comes " in part " from self-control." And this will be so specially in times of change in the direction of men's observation and in the furniture of their imagination. As Cardinal Newman says : †

Few men have that power of mind which may hold fast and firmly a variety of thoughts. We ridicule " men of one idea," but a great many of us are born to be such, and we should be happier if we knew it. To most men argument makes the point in hand only more doubtful, and considerably less impassive. After all, man is *not* a reasoning animal ; he is a seeing, feeling, contemplating, acting animal. He is influenced by what is direct and precise.

4. And yet, if to give to Science the things that are of Science, and to Faith the things that are of Faith, is a task and duty neglected by the many, and but imperfectly accomplished

* " Die Weltanschauungen der grossen Denker," 1890, p. 1.

† " Discussions and Arguments," 1893, p. 294.

by all but a very few—the number of those who realise the importance of this harmony and reconciliation is growing both within and without the Church. Lessing, indeed, could still write as though the actual alternative lay between truth and stagnation, and movement and error. For he says: “If God held enclosed in His right hand all truth, and in His left hand the ever active longing for truth, but with the concomitant of erring always and for ever, and if He were to say to me: ‘Choose!’ I would humbly cast myself into this His left hand and would say: ‘Father, give me this! truth pure and simple is for Thee alone.’” Even Emil Scherer could, thirty years ago, go so far as to exclaim: “Certainty—terrible word!” But the younger generation around us now is largely finding noble utterance for a fuller and a truer creed. Witness Professor Butcher, the Greek scholar, who tells us:*

It is in the confluence of the Hellenic stream of thought with the waters that flow from Hebrew sources that the main direction of the world's progress is to be sought. The two tendencies summed up in the words Hebraism and Hellenism are often regarded as opposing and irreconcilable forces; and, indeed, it is only in a few rarely gifted individuals that these principles have been perfectly harmonised. Yet harmonised they can and must be. How to do so is one of the problems of modern civilisation; how we are to unite the dominant Hebrew idea of a divine law of righteousness and of a supreme spiritual faculty with the Hellenic conception of human energies, manifold and expansive, each of which claims for itself unimpeded play; how life may gain unity without incurring the reproach of onesidedness; how, in a word, religion may be combined with culture.

Witness Mr. Claude Montefiore, that distinguished Jewish scholar, so hypercritical in much, so nobly full of Christian sympathies in more, who thus concludes a lecture on Hebrew and Greek Ideas of Providence and Retribution:†

We have listened to many noble passages, both from Hebrew and Hellenic lips. We listen to them reverently and accept them gladly for what they are worth—palliatives, but not solutions; suggestive hints, but not complete explanations. If, indeed, the great problem were explained, where would be the need of Faith? and if Faith lost its need or its difficulty, it would lose its glory. But whatever may be the knowledge of the angels or of ourselves in another world, in this life the faith which

* “Some Aspects of the Greek Genius,” 1891.

† *Jewish Quarterly*, vol. v. p. 589.

"throws itself without reserve into the arms of God," is surely one of the most glorious of the varied capacities and endowments of man. As, the more vividly the problem is realised, the more vivid must be the faith which can yet believe, so of our own private sorrows and disappointments, which on the old view may seem undeserved, or on a higher view may seem needless or wanton, we may also struggle to prove that the greater the blow or the keener the sorrow the deeper the purification, the more single and devoted the will to which the suffering and the sorrow may lead.

Witness, finally, among Catholics, such vivid apprehension of the spaciousness, the movement and growth, the warmth and assimilating power of the true genius of Christianity and of the Church, as is to be found throughout the remarkable books of M. Ollé-Laprune,* and the astonishingly living pages of M. Maurice Blondel's fine book, "*l'Action*."†

II.

1. Now our first discrimination in our special subject had best be that between Revelation and the Church—Inspiration or assistance to speak on the one hand, and Scripture—Inspiration to write on the other hand. We cannot well conceive of God making rational minds, requiring the Infinite and yet "cabined and failing for breath" in the finite, and not revealing Himself to them. And how grand is the Franciscan idea of not only Revelation but the Incarnation also being independent of the Fall and of Redemption, so that, even if the Fall had never been, God would still have become Man, would still have mercifully met us half-way!† And this necessary Revelation and Incarnation—necessary, that is, as a consequence of free creation—we cannot well conceive of them without a home or an instrument of propagation, without that "extension of the Incarnation," the Church. But we can well conceive of Revelation as given and maintained without Scripture.

* "*La Certitude Morale*," 1880; "*La Philosophie et les Temps Présents*," 1890; "*Les Sources de la Paix Intellectuelle*," 1893; "*Le Prix de la Vie*," 1894. Paris, Berlin.

† Paris: Alcan. 1893.

‡ See the very interesting account in Dr. Westcott's "*Epistles of St. John*," second edition, pp. 283-328; and Mgr. Gay's "*De la Vie et des Vertus Chrétiennes*." Three vols. Paris: Oudin.

2. As a matter of fact and of history, the communication of Revelation by God to its minister was, of course, always mental, and never by writing; nor would it be easy, perhaps even possible, to find, even in the Old Testament, examples of Revelation being in the first instance communicated in writing by its ministers to their audiences. As to the New Testament, we find in St. Paul's Epistles continual proofs that they are but occasional and complementary to his systematic oral teaching, which latter would extend over weeks and months and years. "Faith cometh by hearing," he says himself.* Indeed, we know that our Lord Himself communicated the Christian, the final Revelation by word of mouth alone, and never ordered anything to be written down, nor any already existing writings to be read. Again and again He says to the Apostles, "teach," and to all others, "hear"; nowhere does He say, "write," nowhere, "read." Now this is a far-reaching fact, which the best modern Protestant scholarship fully accepts. Our Lord's words in John v. 39, which alone would seem to militate against it, and which our Rheims New Testament still gives as: "Search the Scriptures," are now more properly translated, both in the English Protestant Revised Version, and in the German critical translation of Dr. Weizsäcker: "Ye search the Scriptures." And Bishop Westcott in England, Professor Godet in Switzerland, and Drs. Meyer and B. Weiss and H. Holtzmann and others in Germany, all agree with Catholic scholars to the Indicative rendering as against the Imperative. And, again, these same authors (Meyer excepted) agree that the following words, "for you think in them to have eternal life," necessarily involve some contrast to the true, our Lord's own, thinking.

3. And as to the principle involved in these facts, we have an admirable vindication of the Catholic position by so impartial, indeed so largely destructive, a Protestant critic as Lessing, who, already in 1778, lays down, amongst others, the following propositions:†

(5) Religion existed before there was a Bible. Of course, a revealed Religion cannot exist before it has been revealed. But it can exist before being written down.

* Rom. x. 17.

† Lessing's "*Werke*," ed. 1874, vol. x. pp. 111-116.

(6) Christianity existed before Evangelists and Apostles had written. An appreciable time passed before the first of them wrote; and a very considerable time before the whole Canon was established.

(7) However much then may depend on these writings, the whole truth of the Christian religion cannot possibly depend on them. I mean, the religion of the Old and New Testaments is thinkable without these books. Indeed, I do not know that any orthodox Protestant has maintained that religion was first revealed in or by one of these books. Rather is it admitted by all learned and thinking theologians that in these books Revelation has been preserved only occasionally, and more or less of it at various times. This more or less, must have been true before it was thus occasionally preserved in writing, and is it to be now looked upon as true simply *because* it has been preserved in writing?

(8) If there was a time when the Christian religion was already so widely propagated, in which it had already mastered so many souls, and in which, notwithstanding, not a letter was as yet recorded of that which has come down to us; then it must also be possible that all that has been written by Evangelists and Apostles should again be lost, and that, all the same, the religion taught by them should continue to exist.

And again on a later occasion :*

(15) Either we must accept nothing, absolutely nothing, of the Christian religion on historical grounds, or we must also accept this, that at all times there has existed an authentic rule of Faith, (20) which derived its credibility from itself, (21) which alone was the incontestable test of orthodoxy, (22) to which all heretics had first to assent, before the Church deigned to argue with them concerning doctrines of Faith from Scripture; (23) in a word, a rule of Faith, together with which the Scriptures were everything, without which they were nothing.

And we have recently had Mr. Gore, in his essay in "Lux Mundi," telling us :† "It is, we may perhaps say, becoming more and more difficult to believe in the Bible without believing in the Church?"‡

We cannot then well think of Revelation without Inspiration, or some kind of assistance to speak—without the Church; but we can perfectly think of it as continuing to the end without Inspiration to write—without the Bible.

* Lessing's "Werke," ed. 1825, vol. vii. p. 4.

† Twelfth edition, p. 248.

‡ See also the third of the eighth Theses of the quite recent "Declaration on the Inspiration of Holy Scripture," of the eighteen High Church clergymen, published by Parker.

III.

1. Now Scripture which need not have been, has been : *copiosa apud eum redemptio* : we have got both the necessary Church and the contingent Bible, beautiful and great. What are the relations between the two ? These relations are two-fold, and it is of primary importance to keep these two sets of relations carefully distinct. The Church rests in part upon the Bible, as containing certain documents of at least human authority with regard to certain limited, specific questions of fact ; the Bible, as a library of Divine, Inspired, Inerrant books, rests, in strict logic, entirely upon the Church.

I will, in this first article, deal exclusively with the first set of relations, and especially with the central facts of our Lord's life as recorded in the Gospels, and hence with the historic credibility and correctness of these Gospel records on at least these particular points.* But here we must carefully note four things :

(1) There is no question as yet of Inspiration or Inerrancy ; no question of detailed harmonisation. As the Encyclical says :†

Since the divine and infallible *magisterium* of the Church rests also on the authority of holy Scripture, the first thing to be done is to vindicate the trustworthiness of the Scripture records at least as human documents, from which can clearly be proved, as from primitive and authentic testimony, the Divinity and the Mission of Christ our Lord, the institution of a hierarchical Church and the primacy of Peter and his successors.

Or, as Fr. Hurter says : ‡

Here we are not treating of the Inspiration of the Gospels, which can be learnt only from Revelation, the existence of which we have not yet proved, but of their *genuineness*, that is, that they are really written by those whose names they bear, and not merely falsely ascribed to them. We are treating—a point of even greater moment—§ of their *authenticity*,

* The double relation between the Old and New Testaments, forwards in the types and prophecies of the Old Testament, and backwards in our Lord's and the evangelist's references to the Old Testament have also, in part, their logical place in this first stage. I will consider them, together with the Old Testament generally, in my second article.

† *Tablet*, Jan. 6, 1894, p. 9.

‡ *Op. cit.*, vol. i. pp. 33, 34.

§ For, even if the Gospels were the work of other authors, they might still be worthy of credence, and this would clearly suffice for our present purpose.

that is, that they are trustworthy concerning the deeds and words of Christ, and that they possess an historic authority sufficient to merit at least the kind of credence which we give to truthful witnesses. Hence it would not contradict this assertion, even if it were demonstrated that the Gospels differ among themselves in minor matters. For we believe historic writers, even if they differ among themselves with regard to minor facts or the minor accessories of facts.

Or, as Bishop Clifford writes : *

The Catholic Church is in existence, and she claims to have been founded by Christ more than eighteen centuries ago, and to have existed without interruption down to the present day. Asked for the grounds on which she rests her claim, she, like any other body claiming ancient descent, appeals to the testimony of history. Amongst other sources of evidence, she appeals to the writings of the New Testament, but she does so not as to inspired books, but as to genuine works of contemporary writers. She appeals to them as she appeals to Tacitus, or Seneca, or other trustworthy authorities, and she asserts their trustworthiness not on the ground of inspiration, but of critical proof. And from the testimony of these and other writers she proves the historical reality of the person of Christ, His founding of a Society, and the identity of the Catholic Church of our day with that society. And this she does on historical grounds and by historical evidence, precisely as English historians show that the English nation of the present day is descended from the English nation of the days of Alfred and of William the Conqueror.

(2) The Church, indeed, rests in part upon the historical authority of the New Testament with regard to at least the substance of the fundamental facts of our Lord's life—but only in part, only *also*, as the Encyclical says. For as the Vatican Council, as quoted by the Encyclical, † nobly says :

The Church, by reason of her wonderful propagation, her distinguished sanctity and inexhaustible fecundity in good, her Catholic unity, and her unshaken stability, is herself a great and perpetual motive of credibility, and an unassailable testimony to her Divine mission.

Or, as Bishop Clifford says : ‡

The very fact of the existence of the English nation at the present day, with all its peculiarities, is a strong link in the chain of evidence available to prove the English descent. And, in like manner, the existence of the Catholic Church at the present day, with its peculiarities,

* *Fortnightly Review*, January 1887, p. 145.

† Conc. Vat., sess. iii. c. 3.

‡ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 145, 146.

is strongly corroborative of the Church's claim to have descended from the original society instituted by Christ. But all this is strictly within the laws of historical evidence.

(3) All these single threads of evidence are, normally, intended to appeal to one already a full Theist, and not to make him into one; that is, they appeal to one who already fully believes in a Personal God, in the intrinsic difference between right and wrong, in Free will and the possibility of miracle, and in the spirituality of the soul; to one, in a word, who already believes that to be possible and desirable which this evidence is to prove to be actual. All our scholastic theologies, all our Apologetic handbooks are based on this method.

(4) These single threads of evidence could be resisted, even in good faith and by such a full Theist, if they were taken one by one; and, even collectively, they but furnish sufficient proof to justify, never to compel, the act of Faith, ever free and meritorious. This cumulative character of all historical evidence is well insisted on by Abbé Duchesne,* as applying also to the proofs for the supernatural character of the Church:

The supernatural character of the Church, the presence within her of a divine Moderator, could not be deduced with sufficient rigour from each one of her triumphs taken singly. All these a human institution, guided by enlightened and wise men, could have accomplished, taken one by one. But the combined whole, her victory in all her simultaneous conflicts, her individual and proper form preserved throughout a development of an immense range and a very long duration—this represents a moral impossibility, if we would remain within the domain of the natural order.

And this free character of Faith is well described by Bishop Clifford:†

An act of Faith is not a scientific demonstration, it is an act of the free will of man; it is service paid to God, but it is a *reasonable* service. "The Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And he that heareth let him say, Come. And he that thirsteth, let him come. And he *that will*, let him take the waters of life freely" (Apoc. xxii. 17).

2. Now all this makes it abundantly clear that, unless we

* "Origines Chrétiennes," pp. 463, 464. Paris: Chauvin.

† *Loc. cit.*, p. 148.

would imprison the approaches of Faith within a vicious circle of reasoning, we can, indeed must, at this stage use ordinary critical and historical standards and methods. These most carefully and these at their very best, but these alone. We will, it is true, even here assume certain philosophical and theological convictions, but they will be such as do not exceed pure Theism. Or again, if we choose to argue from the facts of our Lord's life and teaching back to Theism as well as forwards to historic Christianity, we have still to establish these facts by literary and historic criticism, pure and simple. As the fourth of the Theses subscribed by the Abbé Bautain in 1840 * puts it: "We have no right to demand of an unbeliever to admit the Resurrection of our Saviour, before certain proofs have been given him; and these proofs are deduced by reasoning from the tradition, both written and oral, of all Christians." We have, then, to guard here both against following the mere fads and fashions of the day or anti-Theistic assumptions of any kind, and against in any way treating questions which, at this stage, are purely historical in a temper different from that in which other historical problems are investigated and established.

3. Three points and rules should here be always with us :

(1) If [says Cardinal Wiseman] † we wish to understand an author—*e.g.*, the New Testament, we must transplant ourselves from our age and country, and place ourselves in the position of those whom our Saviour or His disciples addressed. We must invest ourselves with their knowledge, their feelings, habits, opinions, if we wish to understand the discourses which were addressed primarily and immediately to them. For the true meaning of a word or phrase is that which was attached to it at the time when the person, whom we interpret, wrote or spoke.

We are, then, striving to see, feel, imagine and think as did the Jews of Palestine more than 1800 years ago.

(2) And next we must ever bear in mind, with Père de Smedt, the Bollandist, ‡

the great difference that exists between the method to be followed in the sciences whose principal object is the knowledge of facts, and that which is suited to the purely mental sciences. The latter proceed almost

* Denzinger, "Enchiridion," ed. 1882, No. 1491.

† "The Real Presence," 1861, pp. 21, 31.

‡ "Principes de la Critique Historique," 1833, pp. 66, 67.

entirely by way of syllogism; whereas the sciences of facts succeed but very rarely in establishing their theses in such forms of reasoning as can be translated more or less immediately into a syllogism, and impose an irresistible conviction on whosoever is acquainted with the laws of dialectic and knows how to apply them. In general, to gain acceptance for their proofs, the historic sciences have to appeal to a certain faculty of moral appreciation of things—a faculty rather of intuition than of deduction—to that peculiar tact of the intelligence which, in actual life, is called practical good sense, and which supposes in those who possess it more exactness of observation and honesty of judgment than subtlety and depth.

Historical evidence deals with degrees of probability, but may reach, at a certain point in the accumulation of probabilities, a kind of moral certainty which, short of the intervention of the absolute certainties of Faith, reasonably demands assent.

(3) The models of method on which to fall back, when in doubt as to the proper temper to be applied, are those of the best Church historical work, such as Petau's or Mabillon's in the past, or Père de Smedt's "*Dissertationes Selectæ*," or Abbé Duchesne's edition of the "*Liber Pontificalis*" in the present. If still in doubt, we get still further away, to the best work of classical scholars, or again to such general principles as those contained in Droysen's "*Grundriss der Historik*" (also to be had in French), and such examples as Freeman's "*History of the Norman Conquest*," or the works of our own John Lingard.

4. As to examples and materials for sound historical method within the domain and at the stage here in question, the Gospels *quæ* historical documents, I have specially in my mind the following well-known books. For the Greek text: Drs. Westcott and Hort's Text and Introduction; Dr. C. R. Gregory's "*Prolegomena*" to Tischendorf's eighth edition of the New Testament; the beautiful facsimile of the all-important Vatican MS. by Mgr. Cozza-Luzzi (Rome, 1889); Rushbrook's "*Synoptikon*" (Macmillan), or the quite cheap and almost equally useful "*Synopse*" by Huck (Freiburg, 1892). For Catholic introductions: Dr. Kaulen's "*Einleitung*" (Freiburg, 1876) (for textual matters); and commentaries of the past: above all Maldonatus (ed. Raich, Mainz, 1874); of the present: the thorough four volumes on the four Gospels by Dr.

Schanz (Freiburg 1879, 81 ; Tübingen, 1883, 85), and Abbé Loisy's remarkable "Evangiles Synoptiques" (Paris, 1893). Finally, for a full understanding of the point of view of the ablest representatives of the Centre and Left among contemporary Protestant critics, Dr. B. Weiss's edition of Meyer's standard "Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament," vols. i. and ii. (Göttingen, 1883, 5, 6) ; and Dr. H. Holtzmann's Synoptists and St. John, vols. i. and iv. of the "Hand Kommentar zum Neuen Testament" (Freiburg, 1889, 91), are indispensable.

IV.

1. Now the position of affairs is, at this stage, remarkably improved for the Apologist, as compared with fifty years ago.

(1) For, as to previous convictions, if, outside the Church, belief in the actual occurrence of physical miracle has largely waned ; yet belief in personality in God and man, in free will and spiritual miracles, and, again, even in the possibility of material miracles, and specially as to the difficulty of maintaining internal and yet denying external miracle—all this has waxed.* Hermann Lotze, T. H. Green in his latest stage, James Martineau, Andrew and James Seth, are but some of the names of very distinguished and influential believers in such simple but consistent philosophical Theism, the last three being full converts to Free Will.

(2) As to literary criticism, the same improvement is even more marked. Recent discoveries, specially that of the "Diatessaron" of Tatian (1876, 88), and researches, specially Dr. Lightfoot's final demonstration of the genuineness of the seven Ignatian Epistles (1885), Abbé Duchesne's reconstruction of the "Liber Pontificalis" (vol. i., 1886), and Professor Ramsay's archæological work in Asia Minor (published in collected form, 1890-3), have all helped, in various ways and degrees, to reconfirm early dates for the composition of the Gospels as probable, indeed in part as necessary. After years

* As to the difficulty here referred to, cf. the admirable discussion (pp. 115-146) in Dr. Bruce's "Apologetics." Edinburgh : Clark. 1892.

of the most patient and fruitful research and discovery in Asia Minor, Professor Ramsay tells us : *

For years, with much interest and zeal but little knowledge, I followed the critics and accepted their results. In recent years, as I came to understand Roman history better, I have realised that, in the case of nearly all the books of the New Testament, it is as great an outrage upon criticism to hold them for second century forgeries, as it would be to class the works of Horace and Virgil as forgeries of the time of Nero.

But this refers chiefly to the Catholic and Pastoral Epistles, as, with regard to the Gospels, even the Rationalist critics have grown more moderate. Dr. Holtzmann † looks upon the years 69-96 for SS. Mark and Matthew, and 96-117 for St. Luke as the reasonable and now normal dates ; and, as to St. John, he tells us : ‡

As regards approximate dating, the original fixtures of the critical school have undergone a considerable rebatement. The critics have retreated from 160-170 (Baur, B. Bauer) to about 140 (Hilgenfeld), 110-115 (Renan), 100 (Aubé).

Now this latter date is but a few years from the correct traditional one. And, as to the Synoptists, such dates as : composition of St. Matthew's Hebrew (Aramaic) original, in Palestine about 42 A.D. ; St. Mark's Gospel, written in Rome in 67 ; our present Greek translation, re-arrangement and expansion of St. Matthew, if not earlier than 67, yet certainly before 80 ; and St. Luke, written in Rome about 80, would, even purely critically, have no serious difficulties left to contend against. And the Pauline authorship of the seven Epistles to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, Philippians, at one time attacked in each case, is in each case now admitted and defended by such competent Rationalists as Drs. Schmiedel and R. A. Lipsius §

(3) As to historical criticism, we get a similar improvement. For, as to the historicity of our Lord's life, we get from the ablest living representative of the Rationalist Left (Dr. Holtzmann), the declaration : ||

* "The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170."

† "Hand-Kommentar," i. p. 23.

‡ "Einleitung in das Neue Testament," 1886, p. 476.

§ See the Introductions throughout vol. ii. of the "Hand-Kommentar."

|| *Ibid.* i. p. 14

Those who consider that, in the composition of our Gospels, an historical interest was not, or was hardly, a part cause, certainly go too far. On the contrary, we ought, at least with regard to the Synoptic Gospels, to maintain definitely that they contain as their kernel nothing else than the genuine, and in its chief features clearly recognisable picture of Jesus of Nazareth.

As to the position of the Blessed Virgin, we get the same Dr. Holtzmann declaring, on Luke i. 27 :*

With Luke begins the devotional glorification of Mary as Virgin-mother of the Son of God—Mariology. At the starting-point of this process, which found its confirmation in Catholic dogma, stands the Ave Maria gratia plena, the so-called Angelic Salutation.

As to the primacy of St. Peter, we get Dr. Meyer and his editor, Dr. B. Weiss, telling us on Matt. xvi. 18, 19 :†

Thou art Peter, πέτρος, appellative : thou art a rock. The form *πέτρος* is used also by classical authors, and that not only in the sense of stone (as always, in contradistinction to *πέτρα*, in Homer), but also of rock. But the Gospels knew, for the appellative, only the form *πέτρα*, and the consequent slight difference of form was absent only in the Aramaic original, in which the word was both times read *Kepha*. And upon this rock. The emphasis lies on *this*, pointing to Peter : on no other than upon this rock, *i.e.*, upon this rock nature which, as the rock in the parable (vii. 245), could ensure the existence of the house, the continuance and cohesion of the new community. *I will build my church*. The primacy among the Apostles is here undoubtedly awarded to Peter. With this accords also his appearing first in the lists of the Apostles and the actual superiority in which we find him throughout the New Testament in the circle of the Apostles.

And, on John xxi. 15,‡ Dr. Weiss says :

Feed my lambs. Not only is Peter's primacy included in some way or other (so also Meyer, Godet, &c.), but the supreme direction of the community, which he had forfeited by his heavy fall, is re-conferred upon him.

Holtzmann§ is quite as strong on the same side.

* "Hand-Kommentar," i. p. 31.

† "Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar," i. pp. 333, 334.

‡ *Ibid.*, ii. p. 707.

§ "Hand-Kommentar," i. pp. 193, 194, and iv. pp. 203, 204.

V.

And Catholic scholars are, on their part, coming to recognise more clearly, indeed in part to but re-discover, two important points :

1. As to the relation of the Synoptic Gospels towards each other. Here also, it is true, the critics have come and are coming if to greater unity yet also to greater moderation. The documents- or utilisation-hypothesis, in the form of two of the Synoptists having each utilised at least one of the other two ; and the Mark-hypothesis, in the form that even our present St. Matthew is in part younger than St. Mark, and is in part based upon him, have, among the critics, no doubt become the two points of union amidst endless differences of further detail. But even so radical and representative a Rationalist as Dr. Holtzmann admits* :

In the first instance, all the Gospels rest upon oral tradition, and the reminiscences of an anecdotal character which get interwoven with the common historic thread at one time by this, at another time by that Synoptist, still point directly to such a source.

Indeed, this much in favour of the oral-tradition hypothesis had been granted by the critics De Wette and Credner as far back as the twenties and 1836. And, as to St. Mark, Dr. Holtzmann has himself modified his views of 1863, and now practically abandons the hypothesis of a Proto-Mark, *i.e.*, that our second Gospel is not the original work of St. Peter's disciple. He tells us:† “Most at least of the motives for distinguishing a Proto-Mark from Mark have been removed.”

And yet Catholic scholars on their part are rightly coming to give up the Protestant critic Gieseler's oral-tradition hypothesis (publ. 1818) as the exclusive explanation of the Synoptist similarities and differences, and to go back to the documents- or utilisation-hypothesis, which may well be considered the traditional view. It was certainly held, among others by Epiphanius, Origen, Augustine, Bede ; a Lapide, Maldonatus ; and, in our times, by Hug, Reischl, Patrizzi, Franzelin.‡ Take

* “Einleitung,” ed. 1886, p. 358.

† *Ibid.*, p. 357.

‡ Cf. Schanz, “Comm. über den h. Markus,” pp. 26-29.

so conservative a scholar as Dr. Kaulen. In his "Einleitung" he no doubt tells us* that "the relations of the Gospels towards one another is to be explained exclusively by the fact that they are all emanations of the oral Gospel." Yet he also tells us†:

This does not, however, preclude the utilisation of an earlier Gospel by a later evangelist, however independent the latter may have been. Apart from St. John, whose knowledge and presupposition of the earlier Gospels is a matter of attestation, we may assume of the more recent Synoptists that they were influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by the knowledge of an already existing Gospel.

Take so competent a New Testament exegete as Dr. Schanz. In his "Apology,"‡ discussing the parts common to all three Synoptists, he excellently says:

We are not concerned with the greater bulk of matter supplied by St. Luke: for this he might have gathered either from the written sources at his command, or from eye-witnesses of the events, from tradition. But we have in mind the discrepancies in the materials common to all. Why should the evangelists have made such small and, at times, such trifling changes? . . . Some feel a difficulty in supposing that one evangelist corrected and amended another. Well and good; but how are we to get rid of the discrepancies and changes? Is historical fidelity perchance better assured by removing the burthen from the back of the evangelists, and laying it on the shoulders of tradition? . . . To find disagreement in local and numerical details is indeed surprising; but the difficulty is equally great for the tradition-hypothesis. . . . The dependence-hypothesis has failed to solve the synoptic problem, for no other reason, but because it sought to explain the Gospels solely by their literary dependency one on another. The tradition-hypothesis overshoots the mark when it, in turn, discards all written sources.

Take J. Grimm, in his "Leben Jesu," 1878; or Fr. Coleridge, in his "Life of our Life;" or Abbé Loisy, in his "Evangiles Synoptiques":—their positions are, on this point, substantially identical with those of the two Catholic scholars just quoted.

And we are coming to admit, in some form or other, the priority of St. Mark even as against a part of our St. Matthew; to admit, that is, that our extant Greek first Gospel, though containing a re-arrangement and translation of the original Hebrew (Aramaic) work of the Apostle Matthew-Levi, is not

* P. 381.

† Pp. 382, 383.

‡ Glancey and Schobel, Dublin, 1891, vol. ii. p. 465.

merely a translation but an expansion, consisting substantially of a fusion of proto-Matthew with our St. Mark. So, quite explicitly, the very learned Dr. Sepp.* So, more tentatively and vaguely, Dr. Reischl.† So, as to the main point, even the very conservative Dr. Kaulen :‡

The greater or less elaboration of a Gospel corresponds to an earlier or later form of the apostolic preaching. The time of its consignment to writing need not be taken into consideration ; a later document may very well represent an earlier form of oral announcement. This being held fast, we may say that the Gospel according to Mark, because of its great simplicity and vividness of details, allows us to recognise in it the oldest oral Gospel ; its contents lie exactly within the limits which St. Peter (Acts x. 37) assigned to the apostolic preaching.

So, intermittently, Dr. Schanz : §

The difficulties would find their simplest solution by declaring against all utilisation on the part of Mark, and by accepting either the oral tradition- or the Mark-hypothesis. . . . Indeed, both theories agree in this, that they both make the origin of the second Gospel independent of the other Synoptists, and refer it to tradition or the preaching of St. Peter. . . . The philological and logical analysis of the Gospel has often to recognise a primitive character in the second Gospel.

So also, with remarkable apologetic results (see his treatment of the "Raising of Jairus's Daughter," pp. 343, 344), Abbé Loisy in his "Evangiles Synoptiques."

And such a proto-Matthew and priority of St. Mark would not at bottom do more than limit and explain the unanimous declaration of the fathers || as to an original Hebrew St. Matthew, and the traditional order of the Gospels. For no critic of weight, either within or without the Church, thinks of contesting the apostolic authorship of the Aramaic Matthew, or its seniority over St. Mark, or its constituting an important part of our Greek St. Matthew. So that if the question be : "which of the two Gospels contains the oldest writing?" and, again, "which contains apostolic writing?"—on both these

* "Das Hebräer-Evangelium," 1870.

† H. Schriften, ed. 1870, p. 17.

‡ "Freiburger Kirchenlexikon," ed. 1886, col. 1046.

§ "Comm. über Markus," pp. 29-32.

|| The Apostolic Father Papias, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Jerome.

points of time and of rank St. Matthew gets still put before St. Mark.*

2. As to the historical character of the Gospels. Here, as we have seen, even the fully Rationalist critics have come to admit a large element of downright history in the Gospels. But Catholic scholars, on their part, are getting again, like Clement of Alexandria and St. Jerome, to see more clearly and consistently how that the object of the Evangelists, Orientals writing primarily for Orientals, was not always, chiefly in such matters as numbers and time and place and sequence and inter-connection, historical as we now understand history. And they are getting to see and show how this fact militates neither against their truthfulness nor their historical reliability. The cases where they are but following an order of symbolic or subject-matter grouping, or are giving both the words and the spirit and inner thoughts of our Lord's discourses, are being more and more recognised as intentional and more and more distinguished from the actual chronological sequence, and the very words spoken on particular occasions.

As to sequence, we find in the first Gospel instances of an artificial system of grouping according to sacred numbers: so the twice seven generations three times over (i. 1-17); the seven parables (xiii. 1-52, as compared with the three in Mark iv. 1-34); the ten miracles (viii. 2-9, 34). As to subject-matter grouping, the first of its five main divisions (iv. 17-ix. 35) gives us a general picture of the character of that teaching and healing which the heading iv. 23 announces, most of these teachings and healings reappearing in St. Luke, according to the promise of his prologue in their primitive historical setting. So also, our Lord's declaration (x. 15) has been preceded by carefully chosen examples of each of the deeds referred to: "The blind see (ix. 27), the lame walk (viii. 5, ix. 1), the lepers are cleansed (viii. 1), the deaf hear (ix. 32), the dead rise again (ix. 18, 23), the poor have the Gospel preached to them (x. 7)." Such non-historical, though perfectly legitimate subject-matter grouping, performed on

* The Encyclical would seem intentionally to leave room for some such view, where (*Tablet*, January 6, 1894, p. 7) it says, "Now we have to meet the Rationalists," and tells us that they declare among other things, that "the Apostolic Gospels and writings are not the work of the Apostles at all." Note the last two words.

pre-existent documents, is no doubt the true explanation of that "incurable confusion," and of "that great absence of clearness, vividness, historical and chronological precision," which Dr. Schanz tells us* "Catholics† and Protestants appear to agree in finding throughout the first Gospel." Certainly, as to the genealogical instance, it is explained as above by St. Jerome, and, in our time, by the very strict Abbé Vigouroux;‡ and all the others are so accepted by Abbé Loisy and Dr. Schanz.

And, as to St. Luke, he again groups his material—apparently from Proto-Matthew for the discourses, from Mark for the narratives, and from a third very primitive tradition, document or set of documents, for his additions to both§—almost entirely according to the predominantly chronological sequence of St. Mark. The earlier position assigned to the scene in the synagogue at Nazareth (iv. 16–30), and the omission of the northern journey (given by St. Mark vi. 45–viii. 26) between verses 17 and 18 of chap. ix., and the addition, as a substitute, of the entirely new matter of a southern journey at ix. 51–xviii. 14 constitute, in the matter of sequence, the only large difference. Yet the selection of the new, and the exposition of both new and old incidents, is more doctrinally limited and elaborated than in the case of either of the preceding Gospels. The true disciple of St. Paul, St. Luke's

fundamental drift [says Dr. Schanz],|| is the doctrine of grace, mercy, and forgiveness. The narratives of the Sinning Woman (vii. 36–50), of the Pharisee and the Publican (xviii. 10–14), of Zacchæus (xix. 1–10), and of the Penitent Thief (xxiii. 39–43), show the infinite compassion of our Redeemer in the most glorious light, and this again is heightened by the three last words on the Cross which all promise full pardon, and which are recorded by him alone (xxiii. 34, 43, 46). If, again, we compare with

* "Comm. über Matt.," p. 32.

† *E.g.*, Calmet, Haneberg, Schegg, Arnoldi, Grimm, Sepp.

‡ "Livres Saints et la Critique," iii. p. 477.

§ St. Luke's opening words are: "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a narrative of the things that have been accomplished among us; according as they have delivered them unto us who, from the beginning, were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." Now these "many" a stream of Catholic Commentators have, ever since and with Maldonatus, most rightly taken to include the Aramaic St. Matthew and St. Mark. Hence some such combination of documents as is given above would not rest upon the kind of "internal evidence alone" which I take the Encyclical to mean, when it declares it to be "seldom of great value, except as confirmation."—*Tablet*, Jan. 6, 1894, pp. 9, 10.

|| "Commentar über d. h. Lukas," p. 31.

all this the parables in his xvth chapter and find that St. Luke in the first (the Lost Sheep) goes far beyond Matthew xviii. 12-14, and mark the deeply moving picture of the mercy of God towards the penitent in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, we shall find even this much sufficient to instruct us as to the fundamental drift of the Gospel of the heart. Compare also, besides the story of the Infancy, the Raising of the Widow's Son (vii. 11), the Ministering Women (viii. 1-3), Mary and Martha (x. 38), the woman declaring His Mother Blessed (xi. 27), and the Agony in the Garden (xxii. 43).

In one word, it is the Gospel which carries back the genealogy to Adam (iii. 38), as against St. Matthew who begins but with Abraham (i. 2), and which gives our Lord's words as "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful" (vi. 37), as compared with St. Matthew's "Be ye therefore perfect, as also your heavenly Father is perfect" (v. 48).

As to speeches, the discourses in the Fourth Gospel are being more clearly seen to give, and to aim at giving, not only the very words and substance, but also the spirit and inner working of our Lord's mind and heart.*

Cardinal Newman writes :†

Every one writes in his own style. St. John gives our Lord's meaning in his own way. At that time the third person was not so commonly used in history as now. When a reporter gives one of Gladstone's speeches in the newspaper, if he uses the first person, I understand not only the matter, but the style, the words, to be Gladstone's: when the third, I consider the style, &c., to be the reporter's own. But in ancient times this distinction was not made. Thucydides uses the dramatic method, yet Spartan and Athenian speak in Thucydidian Greek. And so every clause of our Lord's speeches in St. John may be in St. John's Greek, yet every clause may contain the matter which our Lord spoke in Aramaic.

The very correct Dr. Hettinger says :‡

The declarations concerning Jesus, the Son of Man, given by the Synoptists are in harmony, as to the matter, with those concerning Jesus, the Son of God, to be found in St. John. A strictly literal

* The two things were nearer to each other for a Jew than they are for us: the Hebrew verbs *amar*, *haga*, *siach* are used indifferently for saying and thinking, just as Homer, in at least six places, uses *φημι*, to announce, for thinking.

† "The Gospel according to St. John." By Rev. A. Plummer. Cambridge. 1894, p. 93.

‡ "Apologetik," 1879, v. i. p. 288.

rendering of the discourses of Jesus is being here as little maintained with regard to St. John as in the case of the longer speeches of Jesus as given by the Synoptists.

All this would certainly be in keeping with the general character of this Gospel, of which Dr. Kaulen says : *

Its peculiarities are explained by this, that its completeness depends upon its combination with the Synoptists; these latter receiving a complement by the Fourth Gospel, which represents actions of Jesus, long known through them, according to those actions, motives, objects and scope. Thus the Fourth Gospel actually appears as what Clement of Alexandria (d. about 217) called it—a *pneumatic*, spiritual Gospel beside the three *somatic*, corporeal ones.

Hence Dr. Schanz is right in saying : †

In the Fourth Gospel we are often in doubt whether a concept is to be taken sensibly or spiritually, where imagery ceases and literalness begins, whether history or symbolism is predominant; but all this is connected with the spirit of the Semitic languages and the individuality of John. . . . The character of this Gospel is neither strictly historical nor strictly dogmatic. But the latter element predominates, and hence the Gospel of St. John has played a primary part in the development of doctrine.

VI.

In our contention with our non-Christian Theist we would then turn, in the parts common to all three or to two Synoptists, for the Chronology, to SS. Mark and Luke; for the very words of the Discourses, chiefly to St. Matthew; for the local colour of the Actions, chiefly to St. Mark; for the deepest insight into the Thoughts and Doctrines, to SS. Luke and John. And we would, generally, take St. Mark first among the Synoptists, and the Synoptists as a whole before St. John.

I will conclude this first stage of our inquiry into the relations of the Bible and the Church with an illustration and reflection with respect to the spirit in which, to be fruitful, indeed to *count* even for a day, the *labor improbus* of the study of the Bible *quâ* human document should, I take it, be conducted by the few who have the gifts and calling to give themselves to

* Fr. "Kirchenlexikon," vol. vi. 1889, col. 1541.

† "Commentar über d. h. Johannes," pp. 51, 52.

this form of service. When the serene scholar-saint, the Benedictine Jean Mabillon was dying, and dying in agonies of pain, after half a century and more of daily service of scholarship and sanctity, his faithful companion, Father Ruinart tells us* how he caused a young priest-relation of his own to be called to his bedside, and there exhorted him to these three virtues above all others : a deep and constant humility, a great simplicity and poverty of life, and, to crown all, a sensitive, deep love of truth. The priest thus exhorted himself writes :

Finally he exhorted me to love truth much—*Deus veritatis*. Be true in all things. Be sensitively scrupulous in the matter of sincerity. You will merit to be faithful on important occasions, if you have been so on those which appear less so—*sinceri filii Dei*. The love of truth is a great grace ; we shall gain it, if we implore and pray God for it. I pray our Lord to grant it to you, and all other graces of which you may stand in need.

Now this difficult gain, this rare grace, this touching prayer and pleading of the open eye—is it not in itself a great, the greatest *apologia*, is it not simply irreplaceable by every and all other gifts ? In the early Church the iron will and the proud contempt of Imperial and imperious Rome were shaken, were softened, were won to a completeness of allegiance exceeding even the completeness of the previous scorn. And this by what ? Was it not by seeing the Christian's love for his brother whom he had seen, that he, the heathen, was brought to join him, the Christian, in adoring and in loving the God whom he had not seen ? And so now. We can hope to bring souls beyond the little they have gained on to the immeasurable they have lost, into the regions beyond the senses and demonstration and within the range of motives and realities which alone can fully touch and feed the springs of action and of life, if one preliminary condition be ever overflowingly fulfilled. Let the modern man be sure of one thing, let him feel it at any and every contact with your mind : that you would feel as a wound any stain on your intellectual honour, any violence done to any fact however small and spurned, that you are striving day by day after intellectual

* "Abrégé de la Vie de Dom Mabillon," 1709, pp. 388-93.

chastity, that your very faith springs from love, a love of truth. He may thus come to suspect that you, who strive so hard and humbly to register and to interpret faithfully and fully that which your brother hath seen, may well deserve some credence when you invite him to move with you on and beyond into what he hath not seen but, with grace and goodness, can and should believe.

FRIEDRICH VON HÜGEL.

ART. V.—THE CURES AT LOURDES.

ONE of the most striking characteristics of an age which prides itself on eliminating the supernatural from the world, and on relying upon science alone, is the steady increase in the recoveries that take place at Lourdes, and in the attention they attract. During the last thirty-six years the number of sick who visit that shrine has come by degrees to be counted by thousands annually, while more than 150 medical men went there last year to study the results for themselves. It is not the least part of the irony of events that it is the very progress of science which has made pilgrimages on such a large scale possible, and also has provided means for testing the recoveries satisfactorily. Side by side with the increased number of alleged cures a more systematic and detailed examination of them has grown up, so that the subject can now be studied by the physician in the same manner as any other branch of medicine. All that could be said after a careful study of the *Annales de Lourdes* may be seen in an able and thoughtful article by Dr. Mackey in a former number of this REVIEW (October 1880), and the credit is his of having preceded other Catholic medical men in England, where they so long hesitated to follow him. There were good reasons for this delay, if I may judge of others by my own case. Lourdes was known to us almost entirely by the work of M. Lasserre, which, in spite of its brilliant literary qualities, or perhaps because of them, was not calculated to satisfy a physician. The cases reported from time to time in the religious journals, and those which reached us on hearsay evidence were hardly more convincing, and did no more than cause us to suspend our judgment. This state of mind ended, for me at any rate, with the publication of Dr. Boissarie's first book.* I then realised for the first time that there was a large mass of medical testimony bearing on the cures, which was available for further study, and seemed to demand it. Among the cases so recorded some seemed to me explicable by the action of the mind on the body; but

* "Lourdes : Histoire Médicale." Paris: Lecoffre. 1891.

others appeared to be wholly out of the ordinary course of nature, and yet supported by testimony which would be deemed sufficient to establish any improbable, but not impossible, event. I will presently give two or three instances of the class of cases I refer to, and will only now remark that the number might be easily increased by quoting from the work in question. One doubt, however, and that a grave one, still remained in my mind. One of the hardest lessons that we all learn in life is not to trust to the fairest appearances without careful and personal examination. It might be, I thought, that the love of the marvellous which carries almost every one away into inaccuracy and exaggeration, had acted with especial force on masses of men stirred by religious enthusiasm, and that the fervid imagination of the South had perhaps clothed its beliefs in the semblance of a scientific method, which might vanish on a nearer scrutiny. My suspicions were enough to make me desire to see the wonders of Lourdes for myself, and to judge on the spot of the way in which the cures are examined and recorded. It seems to me that the testimony of a medical witness, who is at least independent, will be interesting to those who wish for further information; and this is my reason for appearing perhaps too exclusively occupied with my own experiences and impressions. I make no apology to the general reader for the medical details into which I shall enter, for they are the very essence of the subject.

I.

The following are examples of the cases which on perusal seemed to me to be outside the ordinary course of nature, and yet supported by abundant testimony:—

CASE 1.—Peter de Rudder, an outdoor servant at Jabbeke, a village between Bruges and Ostend, had both bones of his left leg broken by the fall of a tree. The fracture was a compound comminuted one, 3 inches below the knee; it did not unite, though treated by six medical men successively. The wound at the seat of the fracture, and a deep ulcer on the dorsum of the foot, remained open; the patient kept his bed for a year, and then dragged himself about on crutches. This state of things lasted for rather more than eight years, when he went on a pilgrimage to the Lourdes shrine at Oosstaker, where, on April 7, 1875, he recovered completely and instantaneously while in prayer before the statue. Such

was his own account at the time, confirmed by a statement signed by the burgomaster of the commune, and eleven of the principal inhabitants, within a week of the occurrence. The whole evidence in this case was gone over carefully last year by Dr. Royer, of Lens S. Rémy, accompanied by a sceptic. He found that de Rudder's ordinary medical attendants were both dead, but one Dr. Van Hoestenberghé, who lives in the neighbourhood, had been told by his deceased colleagues that they looked upon the case as hopeless, and he had himself examined the injury. He saw a deep ulceration in the upper third of the leg, at the bottom of which could be seen the fractured ends of the bones, separated by an interval of about an inch. The limb was movable in every direction, the only limit being the resistance of the soft tissues. The last time the doctor saw the limb was two or three months before the recovery, and he deemed it impossible that a fracture of such long standing and gravity could have healed completely during that time. That no change had taken place during the interval seems to be established by the following testimony. Two persons saw the leg, one nine the other seven days before the date of the alleged cure, and three persons saw him dress the wound the evening before, when he bent the leg so as to make the fractured ends of the bones project. A ticket-porter, who assisted in helping him into the train on his way to Oosstaker, deposed to having seen the leg hanging loose and evidently broken, and to his returning in the evening without crutches and unassisted. De Rudder himself confirmed the account he had formerly given of the suddenness and completeness of his cure, adding some curious details, such as that at first his feet were too tender for him to wear shoes. Dr. Royer examined the limb carefully, and found two cicatrices in the places where the sores had been, and a depression of the crest of the tibia at the seat of the fracture, but no shortening, no thickening, and not the least lameness. I have dwelt on this case at some length, though much of the evidence has been omitted, not only because it is a very remarkable one, but also in the hope that some English surgeon may be induced to investigate it independently. De Rudder lives between Bruges and Ostend, so near our shores that it would be almost as easy and as cheap to subject this alleged miracle to cross-examination as to ridicule or reject it without inquiry. If it is disproved it will be an interesting psychological question how De Rudder succeeded in persuading himself and his neighbours, who were by no means all devout Catholics, that he had been so marvellously cured. Dr. Hoestenberghé, of Stalhille, whom I have mentioned above, offers to accompany De Rudder to either Bruges or Ostend if it is inconvenient for any medical man to go to Jabbeke.

CASE 2.—Marie Lemarchand came to Lourdes with a certificate from Dr. La Néele, of Caen, stating that she was suffering from phthisis, and also from lupus of the right cheek, lips, and part of the mucous membrane of the mouth. Dr. D'Hombres stated that he saw her waiting for her turn to go into the bath, and that he was struck with the particularly repulsive appearance of her face, which was suppurating profusely. He was shortly after called by one of the *baigneuses* to see the patient, when

e found a fresh, red cicatrix covered by a freshly-formed epidermis where the ulceration had been before. Dr. La Néele writes to Dr. Boissarie that on her return home the skin gradually assumed a healthy aspect, and that the pulmonary evidences of disease had disappeared, leaving the patient perfectly well.

CASE 3.—Amélie Chagnon suffered from caries of the second left metatarsal bone with a sinus which freely suppurated. This had gradually become worse during four years, until removal of the bone appeared to be the only course to take; for the last year there had also been strumous disease of the left knee-joint. Both these conditions were certified to by her medical attendants, Dr. Dupont of Poitiers and Dr. Gaillard of Parthenay. She went to Lourdes with the national pilgrimage in 1889; but returned without any improvement. Dr. Dupont states that he saw her the day before her second visit in August 1891, and found her no better than usual. She was bathed at Lourdes, at first with no result; at her urgent entreaty she was put back into the bath, when she felt violent pains in the foot, and was aware that she was healed. Six ladies were in the bathroom at the time; one of them—a Mdme. de la Salinière—states that she distinctly saw the sore on the foot before the second immersion, and that after the bath its place was taken by a recent but perfect scar. At the “bureau des constatations” immediately afterwards, nothing could be detected wrong with the limb except this newly-formed cicatrix; and a few days later her own medical attendants certified to her complete recovery.

CASE 4.—In 1887 Dr. Boissarie saw a woman waiting to bathe her child, a boy of twelve, who had been blind for two years; he had well-marked interstitial keratitis, and a specific history. After bathing, the boy suddenly and completely recovered his sight, and on examination, Dr. Boissarie found only a few spots and a little cloudiness of the cornea remaining.

II.

To come to my own experience. I spent May of the present year (1894) at Lourdes, and believe that I could not have visited it at a time more favourable for observing all its different aspects. During the first part of the month there were few pilgrimages; while on Whit-Monday there was a pilgrimage of 5000 Basque men, but with no invalids. In the last ten days of the month there were two large pilgrimages, with many sick, from Belgium and Lyons; and I then had occasion to see the “bureau des constatations médicales” at work, and the way in which the cases are observed and recorded. The number of sick in these two bodies, 60 Belgians and 200 Lyoneses, was of course small compared with the

vast gatherings in August and September; but for that very reason it was much easier to observe individuals and the pilgrims as a body. I found on my arrival that Dr. Boissarie was not there, that he spends most of his time at his home, at Sarlat in the Dordogne, and only visits Lourdes when the number of sick expected calls for his presence. During his absence the medical bureau is closed, and no plan is provided for recording the recoveries that may take place, though I suppose the clergy would take down such particulars as might be brought under their notice, which could be afterwards examined at leisure. This may seem strange; but it is in accord with the other characteristics of Lourdes. The complete absence of any attempt at interference with the spontaneous devotion of each visitor to the shrine, was the feature which impressed me most strongly from the first, and is one of the greatest charms of the place. In ordinary times no attempt is made to lead or direct the prayers of those who are at the grotto, who are left undisturbed save by the birds singing above, and the rushing torrent hard by. Even during the pilgrimages, though processions, public prayers, and discourses are provided in abundance, every one is perfectly free to attend these or not, as he may prefer, and in any case there is much spare time at his disposal. Miracles, too, fall there into a secondary place, and do not occupy the importance they necessarily assume when they are being exclusively studied. They are, indeed, most eagerly looked for by the pilgrims and other bystanders, and there are the heartiest rejoicings when they are thought to occur. But the ecclesiastical authorities do not take the notice of them I should have expected, and on the whole rather decline to discuss them, leaving their consideration to the medical men in the bureau, if it is at work.

During the pilgrimages, when this "bureau des constatations médicales" is open, it very much resembles an out-patients' department in a hospital. There is a public room, of fair size, but often insufficient for the number of persons it has to contain; and other small rooms are provided for the private examination of such cases as may require it. The bureau is under the authority and control of Dr. Boissarie; and I may say at once that I do not think a man better qualified for the post could have been found. After a successful career as a

student in Paris, he was recalled by his father to practise in his native province; and he appears to me to have profited to the full by the valuable training a country practitioner's life can afford. Before making his acquaintance I had, as I have said, some not unnatural suspicions that he might be too credulous and enthusiastic; but they were soon dissipated on my coming to know him. I found I had to do with a cautious, hard-headed practitioner, with an excellent knowledge of his profession. Above all, I was most favourably impressed by his desire for the fullest publicity, and by his evidently sincere wish that the alleged cures, and the method of investigation, should be independently studied by any medical visitor. For instance, he asked me to take his place at the bureau on the first day it was opened, when he was kept to the house by illness, although he then knew me only as a Catholic medical man, who wished to satisfy himself by personal observation. He welcomed most cordially the ten or twelve of our confrères who came to the bureau during the week it was opened; objections, often vigorously pressed, were always welcomed, and suggestions for the further study of interesting cases were invited. The only thing that appeared to annoy him was the refusal of some to remain long enough to observe for themselves. The records consist of notes taken at the time under the dictation of Dr. Boissarie, or occasionally of some other medical man. Every one is perfectly free to inspect these case-books, and to make independent notes and inquiries. I remarked in particular a physician from Montpellier, who was by no means convinced, and whose criticisms were always to the point, able, and trenchant; he received every assistance and even encouragement to take copious notes for a paper he intended to read before some medical society.

I have dwelt upon my impressions of Lourdes and its *personnel*, because to my mind they are incompatible with the suspicions I had before my visit. It may be thought that the course taken by the clergy and Dr. Boissarie with me and other confrères is part of a policy designed to throw us off our guard, and so to deceive us more easily. Such an idea is absurd to one who like myself has carefully watched during five weeks what passed. But supposing it to be true, it would be an easier and more agreeable duty to hoist the deceivers

with their own petard, to use their professed desire for publicity and free investigation, so as to show where the fraud lies, or at least where the fallacy comes in. Until this is done, it will only be fair and reasonable to suppose Dr. Boissarie is sincere in constantly repeating his desire for the closest and most independent examination, provided that it is conducted carefully and impartially. "These questions," as he has said lately, "are extremely difficult. In order to understand them it is necessary to free one's mind from all preconceived opinions, and to ground one's judgment on serious and long-continued observation, and not on fugitive impressions, hastily collected, which cannot be tested."*

III.

I have already said that one of the things which impressed me most at Lourdes, was the absence of any attempt to excite or rouse the pilgrims: corresponding to this is another remarkable characteristic. During the whole of my stay there I did not observe any of those manifestations of hysteria which I should almost have expected, nor any hypnotic phenomena, though I looked closely for both. I cannot, of course, answer for what may have been witnessed by others; I can only say that such occurrences must be rare, as I remained at Lourdes longer than most persons do, and visited the shrine under all its aspects and at all times of the day, and always found the worshippers quietly devout, and at any rate externally calm. Much of this tranquillity is no doubt due to the systematic injunction of silence, and to the discouragement of gesticulations and contortions; for I have elsewhere shown that these bodily movements seem to be the principal agents in making religious excitement run on into epidemic hysteria or insanity. The most solemn ceremony of all is when the blessed sacrament is carried in procession between the ranks of the sick, while the words are chanted which, the Gospels record, were addressed by the blind, the halt and the infirm to our Lord when He was on earth. Nothing can be more stimulating to the religious mind; but the appeal is an internal one, and the very Presence commands silence and stillness.

* "*Annales de Lourdes*," Juin 1894.

There is unquestionably excitement enough among the bystanders when a miraculous cure is supposed to have taken place; but as far as my own observation, and the report of persons, who appear to me trustworthy, go, it does not run on into anything morbid. I believe the principal force that keeps the emotions of the pilgrims under control is a moral one. Though much is made of course of the supernatural cures that are said to occur, they occupy at Lourdes a secondary place, to an extent which it is difficult for any one who has not been there to realise. Moral and spiritual blessings are sought far more earnestly and more generally than the healing of bodily infirmities. Numerous instances are related of persons who have gone to Lourdes to obtain their cure, but who when there have ceased to ask for it, and either offered their prayers for the relief of others whom they thought in greater need, or sought for resignation to bear their own sufferings. In the same way, one hears there of persons who have been healed, as they have thought miraculously, and who have ever after lived in dread of the increased responsibilities incurred by the renewal of health and strength. The influence of such an atmosphere as this is likely to set bounds even to the craving for life and health which is so deeply rooted in us all. This is a summary of my impressions of the conditions in which the pilgrims are placed at Lourdes; I can now pass on to describe the practical working of the "*bureau des constatations médicales*." During the great solemnities of August and September, when several thousand sick are brought to Lourdes, it is open from early in the morning until late at night; but during my visit there were only 260 invalids, and the working hours were from ten to four or five. Several different classes of patients came to the bureau during that time. There were a few cases of persons who came to seek advice before visiting the shrine; I remarked especially a lady suffering from the results of emotional overstrain, who was handed over to me, and who speedily improved on being encouraged and advised to avoid excitement. Some came to be examined, and have a note of their cases taken, before going to the grotto; these were for the most part isolated pilgrims; those who belong to the organised pilgrimages having to be furnished with medical certificates before leaving home. A few, more seriously ill, or

more nervous, than the rest, came to ask if they might safely bathe in the piscines. There were some sad cases, where the patients had persuaded themselves that they were better, or even cured, but where we had to tell them that their condition was so far unchanged. Among these I remember a poor woman with an extensive sarcoma of the face, and—as might be expected—two cases of advanced phthisis with all the hopefulness common in that disease.

But in the great majority of cases that came for examination after visiting the shrine, there was decided improvement, and often complete recovery. Excluding for the moment a few cases to which I will return presently, the improvement was not more than could conceivably be produced by the action of the mind on the body. These patients might be divided into two classes; in one of which the symptoms were purely neurotic, and where complete recovery was the rule; and another category of persons in whom examination easily detected the persistence of organic disease, but whose general condition was greatly improved. Of the first class—the simply nervous cases—the most numerous examples that I saw were what is called hysterical * paraplegia and paralysis.

Such cases appear to me decidedly more common in hospitals on the Continent than in this country, partly perhaps because there are no workhouse infirmaries to receive them, but mainly I think because the conditions of life are harder there than with us. The number of such cases that go to Lourdes, and the proportion that recover there, cannot be ascertained, for the reasons I have given above, but both are considerable, if I may judge from my own experience. I noted seven such cases which recovered, during the first part of my stay there, when the medical bureau was not open, and when the number of pilgrims was small. One of them, indeed, had been certified by her physician, a German, to be suffering from “*Rückenmarks-schwindsucht*” (locomotor ataxia), but her account of herself to me seemed to prove the case was an hysterical one. I was particularly struck, in these bad hysterical cases, with the immediate recovery, not

* I am compelled to use this word with extreme reluctance; for since the Salpêtrière school has so completely changed the connotation of the term hysteria, it has become even more ambiguous than it was formerly.

merely of the power of movement, but also of the general condition; patients being at once restored to all the appearances of perfect health, to which they had long been strangers. The two following cases, which appear to belong to this class, are worth quoting in detail, both because of their intrinsic interest, and because they are samples of the rich clinical material that comes before the observer at Lourdes:

CASE 5.—A male, thirty-five years of age, one of the Belgian pilgrims, a painter, has suffered from plumbism for nearly five years. The paralysis affected his lower limbs as well as the upper, and he also had anæsthesia, and loss of smell and of taste. He was at first treated by Dr. Houzé, in the Hôpital St. Jean at Brussels. Two years ago he was sent to Paris to be treated by M. Charcot, who twice tried to hypnotise him, but failed. On his return to Brussels he was again treated in the hospital there, and some improvement was effected; but the extensors of both hands were still completely paralysed, the wrists dropped, and the arms could not be raised. After bathing at Lourdes on May 17, the left hand and arm recovered power, and the right limb followed on the 20th, only a little weakness remaining.

The immediate recovery of this patient after such a long course of fruitless treatment is in any case most remarkable. But the symptoms of anæsthesia would no doubt be set down to "hysteria," which Charcot and others have shown to be an occasional result of plumbism. If so, it would in my judgment be impossible to say decidedly that the cure exceeded the conceivable influence of the mind on the body.

CASE 6.—A single pilgrim, a male, sixty-six years of age, fell from a haystack nine months ago and dislocated his left humerus forwards. The dislocation was not reduced, and was followed by paralysis of the flexors of the hand, apparently due to pressure on the median nerve. The loss of power was completely removed, the dislocation being unaffected, on bathing the hand at the grotto on May 22. Here again it seems to me it might be said that the immediate effect of the pressure had passed off, and that the paralysis that was cured was purely psychical in character.

The second class of these cases, in which, the local disease remaining unaffected, the general state greatly improved, were in my experience fewer than those I have just described. Most of those I saw were instances of osteo-arthritis, a fact not without interest considering the neurotic affinities of the disease. But, when we have said that these recoveries do not exceed the possible influence of the mind on the body, their medical interest is by no means exhausted. To say there is nothing remarkable about them, and that they are simply

instances of suggestion carried out on a large scale, is merely to provoke the retort: "Why, then, do you not treat your own patients with equal success?" It must be clear to the most superficial observer that the conditions of suggestion—if suggestion there is—at Lourdes, differ very considerably from those which prevail in the cliniques of Nancy or Paris. There is no evidence of hypnotic manifestations among the pilgrims; and the number of cures of the various neuroses at different times are in no direct ratio to the amount of religious excitement, there being often none during the great pilgrimages and processions. Whatever suggestion there may be must come from within, and, even so, must differ notably from the more common kinds of "auto-suggestion," to use the barbarous word which has been coined for the purpose. Thus, there can be no certain anticipation of cure on the part of the patients; for all are aware that recovery is the exception, not the rule. It is a matter of every-day experience at Lourdes that many who arrive with the most confident belief that they will be healed derive no benefit there; while there are sufficient instances—Dr. Boissarie records a very striking one—where persons were cured who had no hope whatever. The truth appears to me to be, that suggestion is potent in the cure of disease, in proportion, not to its directness and imperiousness, but to its forming a part of the normal mental life of the individual. The former kind of suggestion is like a foreign body, which may compel the living tissues to yield to its impact, but cannot restore health, which must be due to the physiological reaction of the organism. For the same reason, I believe that cure by suggestion is less frequent among the puppets of the Charité and the Salpêtrière, than among the patients treated by the simpler process employed at Nancy; and that it is most real and complete when wrought by the ordinary moral influence of the physician. The wonders worked by this last means will be never fully known, "*carent quia vate sacro*," but they have more elements of permanence about them than those produced by formal hypnotic suggestion.

I do not, however, myself think this is the whole account of the matter. I believe that contact with the supernatural, not only at Lourdes, but in every place where men call for the help of their Creator, may produce much greater effects than

ordinary suggestion or auto-suggestion can accomplish. Such effects would be produced through the influence of the mind on the body; and no argument could be based on individual cases, each of which might be paralleled among instances admittedly natural. But if the environment of patients visiting Lourdes be borne in mind, it will appear very improbable that the kind and degree of suggestion existing there should produce so many complete and permanent cures, even of purely nervous ailments. Nor will this seem antecedently unlikely to theists, who will be prepared to admit that prayer has a superhuman efficacy to change and renew the moral and spiritual nature of man. Those who grant so much will hardly think it unreasonable to believe that such an action may sometimes overflow into the body, which they know to be so intimately connected with the mind.

IV.

The great majority of the cures I witnessed at Lourdes were evidently, in one way or another, due to the influence of the mind on the body; but I saw a few instances, which, if they stand the test of further inquiry, I cannot ascribe to any natural agency. I am not writing a formal work on Lourdes; so that I need not enter into such abstract questions as the limits of the possible influence of the nervous system in healing instantaneously abscesses, wounds, and other organic maladies. I should have done so with great reluctance, because we have not the light of actual experience to guide us. Even Prof. Charcot, when he looked for cures parallel to those recorded at Lourdes, found none in his own vast clinique, but had to go back a hundred and fifty years to the tomb of the Jansenist deacon Paris. Fortunately I need only relate what I have seen, and leave my readers to draw their own conclusions; but before doing so I must describe shortly the way in which the more remarkable cases are studied and tested. All invalids visiting the shrine are requested to bring with them certificates from their ordinary medical attendants, these being obligatory for all who join one of the organised pilgrimages, who also have to bring with them some evidence of their respectability and general antecedents. These certificates are taken as

prima facie proof of the state of the patients ; but no one who has experience in such matters will be surprised to learn that they are often very short, wanting in clearness, and inadequate. When a case of recovery is observed which seems to call for further examination, the certifying medical men are written to for further details ; and the case is published in the "Annales" as an apparent cure. Objections have been raised against this latter step ; but I think, with Dr. Boissarie, that the best means of arriving at the truth in matters of fact is by the fullest publicity. In support of this, he is able to quote instances where their publication led to withdrawal on the part of the medical men, or to such other explanations as removed them from the category of the marvellous. Seventy cases which recovered were reserved for study in 1893, out of which number twenty at most are likely to be thought sufficiently established ; and these again will be subjected to a further inquiry after two or three years, in order to see if recovery is permanent ; a precaution especially necessary to phthisis, epilepsy, and other diseases that naturally run an irregular course. It will be understood that the following cases have not yet had their past history completely investigated ; I have suggested the principal directions which that inquiry will take.

CASE 7.—A female, aged thirty-five, a Lyons pilgrim. She has had caries of the left femur for two years ; two incisions have been made, together 11 inches long, through which diseased bone was removed. Three drainage-tubes were put in, the suppuration was profuse, and the patient was unable to walk, being carried about Lourdes on a stretcher. During her third bath she experienced severe pain, the drainage-tubes fell out, and the wound healed over ; she was able to walk to the bureau, though still lame. On examination the wound was found to be completely closed, though the cicatrix looked quite recent. The patient and her companion produced bandages which were soiled by free suppuration, which they said had been taken off just before the bath. Here inquiry will have to be made of the medical men who attended her, what was the precise state of the wound when last seen at Lyons.

CASE 8.—A female, aged forty-five, also a Lyons pilgrim, brought two certificates from two hospital surgeons at Villefranche, stating that she was suffering from organic disease of the hip-joint. For the last eighteen months she has worn an elaborate support, by the help of which she has been able to walk, but with great difficulty. On May 17, after the bath, she was able to walk easily, though stiffly, without the support, to

the bureau, where we could discover no sign of disease. This patient, who had been a hospital nurse, had no appearance of being hysterical, but cases of supposed joint disease are always suspicious. It will therefore be necessary to make a very close examination of the grounds on which the certifying medical men based their diagnosis.

Cases 8 and 9 are both instances of recovery from blindness, certified to by the medical attendants, but with insufficient details. One was sympathetic ophthalmia, the right eye having been previously destroyed by injury; the other had been apparently glaucoma, for which double iridectomy had been performed without success. Both suddenly recovered their sight while at the grotto, and on coming to the bureau were able to read without difficulty. The left eye in the second patient was much smaller than the right.

CASE 10.—Jean de Brower, twenty-nine, of Oudenarde in Belgium, fell from a ladder on his abdomen thirteen years ago; he was very ill for some time with severe pain and vomiting, and never completely recovered. Three years since he had pleurisy and hæmoptysis, and sixteen months ago the abdominal symptoms became aggravated; there has been ever since much pain and tenderness, considerable distension, vomiting, constipation alternating with diarrhœa, and occasional melæna. He was treated by the physicians of the hospital at Oudenarde, who certify his case to be one of tubercular peritonitis, his local symptoms and general condition meanwhile growing steadily worse. He was brought from Belgium to Lourdes in a bed in the guards' van, being judged too ill to travel in the ordinary way, but he suffered so much and was so weak that the doctor who accompanied the Belgian pilgrimage expected him to die on the road. On his arrival at Lourdes I saw him carried into the hospital on a stretcher, and remarked to a bystander that in England it would be thought criminal to bring patients apparently moribund on such a long journey. On the afternoon of the next day—May 17—he was taken down to the baths, but the attendants refused to bathe him, and merely sponged his abdomen with the water. He immediately felt very severe pain, which, however, only lasted a short time; he wished to walk, but was not allowed to do so. Shortly after, he was taken to the bureau, where he was examined by Dr. Boissarie and two other medical men, who found his abdomen soft, free from pain and tenderness, and so much smaller that his drawers, which before fitted him, were now 30 centimetres (11·81 inches) too large for him in girth. His general weakness and the long disuse of his legs still made walking very difficult to him; he was accordingly carried back to the hospital, where he made a large meal of soup, meat and bread, which gave him no trouble. When I saw him on the 19th there was no sign of illness about him, except some uncertainty of gait, and even this had passed away before he left Lourdes on the 22nd, when he seemed perfectly well. The diagnosis of chronic peritonitis, ordinary or tubercular, is usually easy; and the history given of this patient entirely supports the opinion of the physicians who had attended him. We have to remember, on the other hand, that abdominal diseases are almost proverbially difficult; and that "phantom tumours," in par-

ticular (I do not know if they have ever been seen in a male), deceive even the elect. The evidence in this case requires, therefore, to be completed by full details from Oudenarde.

The above cases give, I believe, a very good general idea of the questions that are raised at Lourdes by some of the recoveries, and of the way in which they are investigated. The results of such examination in many other instances may be seen in Dr. Boissarie's second book—"Lourdes depuis 1858 jusqu'à nos jours"—published last spring. The principal difficulty arises from the scantiness of the information furnished by the patients' medical attendants, often indifferent or hostile; and most of the various remedies suggested for this do not seem to me satisfactory. For instance, it has been suggested that photographs of every patient should be taken before visiting the shrine; and to some extent this has been done; I saw some well-executed photographs of ulcers brought by Belgian pilgrims. But the province of photography in such matters is a limited one; and the identification of the photographs of persons cured would depend on testimony which might be impugned—who is to prove to an inquirer that a photograph of an ulcer of the leg, for example, really belonged to a person who is alleged to be healed? Again, it is often said that every patient should be examined on arrival at Lourdes by a medical committee. This would not merely be impossible when there are many pilgrims, but the testimony of physicians connected with the shrine might be thought partial and open to some not unnatural suspicion. The recent decision of the Société de St. Luc to appoint a medical committee to examine the sick who join the August pilgrimage from Paris, seems a step more in the right direction. It also seems to me that something might be done by devising a form of certificate which should be supplied to the medical attendants, and which would require the principal symptoms, past and present, as well as the diagnosis based upon them. It is interesting to observe that most of the precautions, on which visitors have insisted before they would accept any cure as supernatural, will be found to have been realised in one or another of the cases recorded. For instance, it is often said that a case, to be satisfactory, should have been seen by an independent medical man immediately before recovery; case 2 quoted above, is one in which this

condition was fulfilled. In case 3, again, the cure was witnessed by several non-professional persons, as M. Zola appears to prefer; while case 4 meets the wishes of those who think that Dr. Boissarie should have seen a case before as well as after recovery. This, however, is by the way; the only point I desire to press is that I believe I have made out a case for inquiry on the part of those who can afford the time. Very probably they will see nothing that clearly transcends the power of nature. Miracles are not worked to order; and if they were, it is always possible to take refuge in the unknown, or to ask for further evidence. But at least every unprejudiced visitor will see much that is very well worth seeing; and may be sure of a cordial welcome, and every facility for studying the material that will be so abundantly provided for him.

J. R. GASQUET, M.B.

ART. VI.—QUEEN ELIZABETH AND THE REVOLUTION.

II. THE PREPARATION FOR SAINT BARTHOLOMEW.

AFTER the assassination of the Duke of Guise, and the return of Condé to a temporary allegiance to his King, the position of the English in France underwent a change. Elizabeth, in giving the first impetus to the revolutionary movement, was in a large measure responsible for the disasters caused by the machinery she had set in motion, and even when she was no longer the chief motive power of the rebellion, she was ever ready to widen the breach she had helped to make between the insurgents and their lawful sovereign. It is remarkable that she was never in any single instance on the side that made for law or order. But Throckmorton, who was always reminding her that her greatest chance of success lay in her identifying herself with the Protestant cause, had ceased to influence her policy. By the French loyalists he was naturally looked upon with deep suspicion; and even the Huguenots, now that their star was in the ascendant, evinced but little gratitude for the help, without which it would have been impossible for them to have attained the proud position they enjoyed. Throckmorton's day was practically over, and of Elizabeth's two ambassadors in France, Sir Thomas Smith, although vastly his inferior in shrewdness and experience, was by far the more important and powerful. His advice to the Queen to throw over the Huguenots, in the hope that the King of France would before long offer her Calais, was more to the credit of his tact than of his political insight. As they however, in the first flush of their triumph showed that they esteemed the friendship of Elizabeth but lightly, it was evidently her best policy to pursue her own ends independently of them.

Intoxicated by success, and keen as ever to discover analogies between their cause and that of the ancient people of God, the Huguenots compared Poltrot the assassin, to Judith, smiting Holofernes. A book was printed in order to

justify the crime by references to passages in the Bible ; and Poltrot was accounted a martyr, while his portrait, carefully preserved, was honoured as Catholics honour relics.* But while the Huguenots were worshipping Poltrot, Coligny was exposed to the hatred of the Catholic populace, as at least the accomplice of a mean and dastardly act from which all true men must recoil with horror. "God give," wrote Sir Thomas Smith, "that he be not killed, as they say he killed the Duke of Guise."

The fear expressed in these words was not unfounded, for the whole country writhed under the yoke of the exultant rebels. As their power had grown, so had their cruelties. Pillage and murder were now crimes of daily occurrence.

In April 1562, Throckmorton writing to Elizabeth, described their excesses in the west. Tours and its castle had fallen into their hands with a good store of ammunition. Not far from Tours was the rich abbey of Marmoutier, where they defaced all the images, and stole the relics and costly treasures from the church. These were but the beginnings, and the city of Orleans will for ever bear the traces of the lawlessness to which it fell a prey under Condé.

The churches were wrecked, and the Cathedral was turned into barracks. At St. Aignan relics of the saints were publicly burned in the market-place, and the Blessed Sacrament was openly profaned. At Patay, the scene of Joan of Arc's victory, the Huguenots caused twenty-four persons who had taken refuge in the belfry from their violence, to be burned alive. Priests and religious were the special objects of their fury. To the brutality with which these were executed in England, was added a refinement of barbarity. If the victims were still alive, after having been tied to the tails of horses and dragged over the stones and through the mire to the place of execution, their hands, feet and noses were cut off, and their eyes dug out. Then they were flayed and strung up to trees as targets to be shot at.†

Thus it will be seen that the abominations committed by the "Beggars" of the Netherlands, by the Anabaptists in

* Francis Peyto to Throckmorton, Oct. 31, 1564. R. O.

† Maimbourg, "Histoire du Calvinisme en France," l. iv. p. 244.

Germany, and by the Puritans in England were equalled, if not surpassed, in France. The infamous Baron des Adrets, whom the people called "the new Attila," was Coligny's faithful agent in the south. In taking possession of Lyons in May 1562, his first act was to declare freedom of conscience and of religious worship; his next, to abolish Mass, and to forbid any priest to celebrate, under pain of death. Twice a week he obliged the Lyonese to listen to a Huguenot discourse composed of invectives against their religion, imposing a penalty of ten livres for each absence. Scarcely a church in the south of France escaped destruction. At Grenoble, monks and nuns were tortured to induce them to apostatise. The Grande Chartreuse was delivered to the flames. The whole population of the little town of Mornas in Provence, was put to the sword, and the three hundred soldiers who defended the garrison were hurled from the ramparts into the plain below. Montbrison was entirely given up to the brutality of Des Adret's soldiery, and the night which followed the taking of this town was passed in atrocities, of which assassination was the least horrible. The sun rose on a scene which beggars description; livid corpses, hideously mangled, were heaped up in the market-place, and the streets literally ran rivers of blood.*

Even Calvin remonstrated with the immediate author of these inhuman cruelties, although he by no means disowned, but on the contrary approved, the *principle* of civil war and revolt from legitimate authority, of which they were the outcome.

After the victory of Dreux, the King had declared an amnesty in favour of the insurgents, but, instead of laying down his arms, Coligny marched into Normandy, leaving fire and blood in his train. At Sully, according to the Protestant historian La Poplinière, he caused thirty priests to be stabbed, and several others to be thrown into the Loire.

We must anticipate events somewhat, in order to point out the excesses committed by "those of the religion" in their capture of La Rochelle in 1568. The Jarnac manuscript†

* Vie du Baron des Adrets, Allard; also Maimbourg, Castelnau, Brantôme and others.

† See Jager, vol. xv.

describes how that priests and laity were treated with greater cruelty than would have been practised by an army of Turks, had they landed in that place. In all the towns which fell into the hands of the Huguenots, the same story was repeated, but Nîmes witnessed scenes unequalled for cruelty by any which signalised the fearful vengeance of the night of St. Bartholomew. At Nîmes, all that was done was done in cold blood; there was an entire absence of that popular frenzy which made every attempt futile to stem the tide of retaliation on the awful night of the 24th August, 1572. A solemn torchlight procession was formed, and silently, with horrible precision and passionless regularity, such as would not have been out of place in a court of justice, the Catholics were made to march one by one to their death. The place of execution was the crypt of the parish church, where as each victim arrived, the Huguenot poignard was buried in his bosom. Men, furnished with torches were stationed on the steeple and at the belfry windows, to illuminate the scene of carnage, which lasted from eleven o'clock at night, till six in the morning.* The following year, the persecution was renewed, but instead of shedding blood, the Huguenots contented themselves with hurling their victims into a deep well, outside the town, and for many years afterwards this well was called by the inhabitants of Nîmes "the well of the evil death."†

What the Baron des Adrets was in the south, such was Gabriel de Montgomery in Normandy, and the history of his progresses is but a repetition of the atrocities we have taken at random from a host of similar scenes. They will suffice to form some estimate of the accumulation of wrongs which embittered the lives of the people during the twelve years in which the Huguenots were virtually masters of France. And yet these things have all been forgotten, and the reply of a people goaded to madness is alone remembered. It was inevitable that when the day of reckoning came it should be an awful one.

To every impartial mind [wrote Segretain], after half a century of war and massacre, in the midst of scenes of violence to which there promised

* Cantù, "*Histoire Universelle*," vol. xv. Notes.

† "*La Popelinière*," l. xx.

to be no end, St. Bartholomew is no longer a marvel of horrors of which Catholicism bears the responsibility, witnessing to its own barbarous intolerance. It was far rather the day of retribution for so many similar days celebrated in like manner by the Huguenots. It remains the fulfilment of a perverse policy, but of a policy that was supported by a whole nation, only asking for leave to fall upon their prey, in their thirst to avenge the blood of their murdered brethren, and their religion so long trodden under foot and outraged.*

But we must return to the year 1563, to find the Queen Regent embarrassed between the exultant rebels, and a party henceforth without a leader. Unmoved by the sight of all that the nation was suffering from Huguenot intolerance and cruelty, and considering only that they were likely to endanger the very existence of the throne, Catherine resolved to make peace with them. She had already succeeded in winning over Condé, who, in spite of Elizabeth's anathemas, was well enough pleased with the result of his secession. He had obtained from the Regent, the famous edict of Amboise, by which the Protestants were formerly reinstated in their possessions, with the liberty to practise their religion in certain towns named in the edict. But Coligny, dissatisfied with these terms, which he considered inadequate, demurred and reproached the Prince with having wrought the ruin of more Protestant churches than the combined forces of the enemy would have destroyed in ten years. But, notwithstanding this dissatisfaction, Sir Thomas Smith assured Elizabeth that the Admiral would not prove a more faithful ally than Condé; and when it was found that both Huguenot chiefs had received from the French government a large share of the sum levied on the Catholic clergy under pretext of an impoverished exchequer, Coligny's name, together with that of the Prince, was held up to public scorn throughout England. Pending negotiations, Coligny slowly made up his mind to the inevitable, while Catherine in her fortified castle of Blois was uncertain in what spirit he was advancing to meet her. Peace was at last signed under the walls of Blois, and on the 25th March, the Admiral entered the town followed by his lawless soldiery. Catherine could see them from her windows pillaging the neighbourhood for miles around, utterly regardless of the treaty that had just

* Sixte Quint et Henri Quatre.

been signed. She went out however, to meet Coligny with expressions of the most cordial friendship, knowing well the value of adroit flattery, and the Admiral's particular sensitiveness in this respect. He on his part, held out hopes that he might induce the English to surrender the towns of Normandy, which they held, on condition that he should be allowed to march into the Low Countries, a favour which he esteemed above all others. The peace was followed by public rejoicings and mutual congratulations. The Court swarmed with Huguenots; when the King went to Mass, his suite, consisting chiefly of Protestants, remained at the Church door; and it was expected that their service would soon be allowed in the palace.

As was to be expected, the turn matters had taken met with no sympathy in England, and the loud assertions of Condé and Coligny that they had had nothing to do with letting the English into Hâvre, only increased the irritation. The blame of that proceeding they threw on the Vidame of Chartres and Beauvoir, who, thus accused, declared that they had acted under the orders of the two chiefs, and had received sealed instructions from Condé. The same day Middlemore informed the Earl of Warwick, who had taken possession of Hâvre with a large and well-disciplined force, that both Coligny and the Prince of Condé had pronounced against the restitution of Calais.

The French [he added bitterly] may change their religion but not their character. Be on your guard against their treachery. Every Frenchman ought to excite our suspicion, and as they all have the same character, I am not better disposed towards one than towards the others. It behoves us to keep Hâvre better than we kept Calais.*

The case was hard, but Englishmen ought to have reflected that men who had proved themselves traitors to their country were scarcely likely to remain faithful to their allies, when instead of disgrace and punishment, wealth and honours awaited them at home. Elizabeth could do no more for them than Catherine was willing to do. It was feared that Condé would desert the Huguenots altogether. "It only depends on Catherine," wrote Chantonny, "to take him to Mass."

* Forbes, vol. ii. p. 379.

The new allies were now apparently so much absorbed in feasting and rejoicings, that onlookers might well be justified in thinking them a little oblivious of their position with regard to England. Sir Thomas Smith perceived the advantage that might even now accrue from resolute action. Instead of for ever *claiming* Calais, Elizabeth's advisers would do well in the midst of the general confusion, if they had the courage, to *seize* it without more ado. But to this Elizabeth replied that she had formal promises signed and sealed by Coligny and the Prince.*

Meanwhile Catherine had invited Coligny to enter her good city of Paris, but it was still so much agitated by the murder of the Duke of Guise, that when the Admiral had advanced within two leagues of the capital, the Constable of France came out and advised him to retire, declaring that his presence within the walls would but increase the irritation which the bare mention of his name evoked. The whole Parliament were against him, and if the Constable had not taken him under his protection, he would probably have been killed there and then.†

Charles IX. had summoned Elizabeth, peace being restored in France, to evacuate Havre; but she had replied that not having occupied that port in the Huguenot interest, but in her own, she meant to hold it until it was exchanged for Calais.

Preparations were therefore made for the siege of Havre, and money being scarce, Charles summoned the Council of the city of Paris to raise a loan of one hundred thousand crowns in order to rid France of the English. They only replied by murmurs, and the King then ordered the temporal goods of the Church to be sold to the amount required. On the 6th July, war was declared with England, and the French troops poured into Normandy. Condé appeared under the royal standard, when the French army assailed the ramparts of Havre. "His inconstancy is such," wrote Middlemore to Cecil, "and he has so far forgotten God and his honour, that he invites those of the religion to serve in this war against the

* Forbes, vol. ii. p. 394.

† Languet, Letter of June 20, 1563.

Queen of England."* In spite of Middlemore's appeal to Warwick that they should keep Hâvre better than they had kept Calais, the garrison made but a feeble show of resistance. Their supply of fresh water coming to an end, the plague broke out, whereupon the place capitulated, only a few moments before the English fleet bringing provisions and reinforcements of men appeared on the horizon.†

Condé flattered himself that he would now be made Lieutenant-General of the kingdom, according to a promise that had been made him, as a reward for what he had done; but Catherine circumvented his ambition by declaring the majority of her son, thus maintaining a position of authority which she was determined to share with no one.‡ It was, however, at the same time convenient to ignore the fact that the Prince had been mainly responsible for introducing into France the very enemies he had just helped to expel, and he continued to enjoy the greatest favour at Court. He was even able to make the Vidame of Chartres, who had actually given up Havre to the English, at least tolerated.

Thus it will be seen that patriotism under Catherine of Medici had sunk to a very low ebb. Coligny was also frequently to be seen at Court, though not without exciting the indignation of the nobility, and the widow of the Duke of Guise demanded in vain, notwithstanding his laboured "purgations," that he should be brought to justice. The more he protested his innocence, the more public opinion pronounced him guilty, but the matter was destined never to be satisfactorily settled.

Foremost among the new favourites was Madame de Crussol, celebrated for her piquancy, her sharp tongue, and her political intrigues. A rabid Huguenot, she had the power of disposing of abbeys and rich benefices, and was even able to appropriate the revenues of a vacant bishopric in Provence. She kept up a secret correspondence with Queen Elizabeth, and expressed the confidence of the whole Huguenot party when she declared: "This year the Mass will be abolished throughout France!" Charles IX., to whom the saying was reported,

* Middlemore to Cecil, July 19, 1563, Forbes, vol. ii. p. 473.

† Le Frère, p. 208.

‡ Dupleix, p. 659.

replied, probably at his mother's instigation: "And I will cut off the head of any one who refuses to go to Mass!"*

The King, thus strangely reconciled with all the conflicting elements among his people, made a proclamation to the effect that strict obedience to his orders would be exacted. The nobles he declared had but one master, and that master was the King.

It only remained for England to lay down her arms, and the treaty of Troyes was accordingly signed on April 11, 1564. Elizabeth made some difficulties about Calais, but Catherine settled for ever the destiny of that port by promising to repay her the money she had lent to Condé. Charles was invested with the order of the Garter, and the youthful monarch feigned, as was expected of him, to enter the lists as Elizabeth's suitor. He assured her that he esteemed her love and amity more than gold or silver.† The only discontented person was Throckmorton. There had been considerable friction during the whole process of the negotiations between Elizabeth's two ambassadors in France, and at the conclusion of the treaty this friction developed into an open quarrel. Sir Nicholas Throckmorton finally returned to England in disgust, leaving Sir Thomas Smith in attendance at the French Court.

Catherine's chief anxiety henceforth was to maintain a safe equilibrium between the two conflicting parties in the State, and it must be confessed that she showed little partiality for either. When the Huguenots took offence at what they considered an undue share of favour on the part of the Queen towards the Catholics, she was quite ready to turn her back upon the Guises, and to show Condé or Coligny some special sign of regard. But it was not long before she became aware of the danger of such a policy. The object of all the concessions made to the Huguenots, was the maintenance of the King's authority and prestige; but it was clear that instead of strengthening the royal cause, she had by her want of integrity, decision, and courage stultified her own object and brought about the very catastrophe she wished to avoid. All that the Huguenots did, made for revolution, and the more they basked

* Spanish Despatches of 1564. Nat. Arch., Paris. K. 1501.

† Stevenson, "Cal. State Papers," Foreign Series, 1564-5.

in the royal favour, the less secure was the throne. "The Court of France," wrote Cardinal Granvelle, "is now convinced that unless the Catholic religion is restored it will be impossible to uphold the King's authority." A firm resistance at the beginning of the peace could not have but kept the rebels in check, and have caused the King's government to be respected; a change of policy which was clearly the result of fear, brought it into contempt. The greater the weakness displayed towards them, the more intolerant they became. Henceforth Catherine, whom they had hailed as the Esther who was to be their salvation, was never called by any other name than Jezebel. They threatened her with assassination, and circulated a pamphlet in which it was declared lawful to kill any one opposed to what they were pleased to term "the spread of the Gospel." A man, lying under sentence of death, confessed that he had received money from Coligny to assassinate the King,* and when he was confronted with his accomplices, he repeated his confession; but it was thought dangerous to found an accusation against Coligny without further proof, and the man's execution was hurried on.

Meanwhile, the Court being absent in the south, the Huguenots took the opportunity to multiply their secret meetings, and there was a confused talk of a recourse to arms. They divided the whole of France into districts, in order that a rising might the more easily be effected; and it was whispered that in a week they would be able to muster eight thousand horse.† They were ready to rise at Lyons, at Orleans, at Bordeaux, and in Languedoc; so great were their numbers that in October 1564 twelve thousand of them partook of the Lord's supper at Orleans alone.‡ There was a rumour that Condé was to form a junction with the Admiral at Compiègne, and that their united armies would be ten thousand strong. Coligny, supported by the Protestant princes of Germany, was to demand the hand of Elizabeth.

Catherine, at last driven as it were into a corner, made a public profession of her zeal for the Catholic religion in presence of the Papal Legate at Avignon, and took part in one of

* Davila, Book IV.

† Languet, "Sel. Epis.," p. 311.

‡ Nat. Arch., Paris, Simon Renard.

those fervent religious processions so common in the south. At that moment the Archbishop of Glasgow arrived at Avignon, for the purpose of securing her help in a war against England, of which the object was the deliverance of the persecuted English Catholics, and the advancement of Mary Stuart's claim to the throne. Hereupon followed a network of alliances and counter-alliances which in their turn were disregarded and new ones formed, without serving any cause but that of personal ambition and self-interest. In the midst of these, Catherine made up her mind to an interview with her daughter, the young Queen of Spain, at the foot of the Pyrenees. If Philip could be persuaded to accompany his wife, much as Catherine feared and disliked him, a league might be arranged between them against the heretics of France and the Netherlands. But before the proposed meeting could take place, Philip had quarrelled with the Pope on a matter of precedence between the ambassadors of Spain and France at Rome. He had sent away the Nuntio from Madrid, had recalled his ambassador from the Papal Court, and was at least listening to a proposal made by Coligny and Count Egmont, to help the Huguenots against the King of France. Condé was opposed to any alliance with Spain, and declared that he would forsake the Huguenots altogether and even become the Pope's ally rather than form any friendship with Philip II.* The negotiations therefore went on without him.

Although Philip was too much a Catholic at heart to think seriously of such a coalition, there was, if not a complete rupture, at least a coolness between him and Catherine, who made advances towards Elizabeth, in exact proportion to the distrust with which she regarded her son-in-law. Just about this time Elizabeth quarrelled with Leicester, and wrote the mysterious sentence regarding him in a book at Windsor, and Catherine, thinking to turn the Queen's pique to her own advantage, once more proposed, through the French ambassador in London, a marriage between Elizabeth and Charles.

These advances towards Elizabeth were but a preliminary step towards a fresh reconciliation with the Huguenots, who as soon as hostilities were suspended, began to declare boldly

* Phayre, Letter of April 26, 1565. R. O.

that before long, Charles IX. would re-enter Paris as a Protestant.

Between the Huguenots and the Infidels there was, in Catherine's mind, no impassable gulf fixed, and once having shown herself ready to treat with the rebels, knowing to the full their hatred of law, order and discipline, and seeing the effects of their ascendancy in the deeds of blood daily committed by them throughout the French provinces, it ceases to be surprising that she should seek to strengthen her position by an alliance with the Turks. But they were preparing to make a descent upon Venice, and Catherine, in allying herself with them, drew upon herself the odium of having formed a friendship with the bitterest enemies of Christendom. When at length the long-deferred interview with Philip took place at Bayonne, she was anxious to keep this negotiation a secret from him ; but it was divulged by the English ambassador to Don Francis Alava, Philip's representative at Paris. At this celebrated interview, the principal matter under discussion was the question of the Huguenot rebels. The sacrifice of a certain number of their leaders would, in the opinion of the Duke of Alva, prevent torrents of blood in the future,* and his predictions were completely verified by after events ; but it was soon found that nothing would induce Catherine to act towards them with any degree of firmness or consistency. "All good people have lost courage," wrote Don Francis Alava, "especially those who have heard the Queen Mother talk religion."

Promises and apparently resolutions were not wanting on her part, for Philip was able to write as follows to Cardinal Pacheco :

My intention having been clearly expressed of seeing religious affairs settled in France, with entire obedience to the King, the Queen-Mother has undertaken, in presence of the Duke of Alva, to remedy the evil as soon as possible, that is, as soon as she has returned from her journey. This resolution has been kept secret, for if it were known the remedy would become difficult.

But Philip was profoundly ignorant of Catherine's character, if he really placed any reliance on promises wrung from her at

* Nat. Arch., Paris. K. 1504 ; Letters of the Duke of Alva, June 21, 1565.

a moment when she appeared to be full of fervour and emotion. Her beautiful eyes might indeed fill with tears, and her voice tremble, as she owned that she would be ungrateful to God if she did not make every sacrifice for the upholding of religion; but she was incapable of any fixed purpose, except the purpose to commit herself to nothing, and after the interview at Bayonne she remained what she had always been, a true daughter of the Medici and an apt pupil of Machiavelli. The passions of her soul were manifold; she was cruel, vindictive, and unscrupulous, but her greed for power was stronger in her than all else.

She was as ready to sacrifice her children to her own ambition, as she was to betray her conscience and the religion about which she could discourse so eloquently. Her capacity for business was as great as her love of the fine arts, qualities which she inherited from the great Florentine merchants her forbears. For her splendid horsemanship, the French compared her to the goddess Diana; but when the chase was done, arrayed in rich gold and silver brocades from the looms of Italy, and sparkling with gems that added a lustre to her singular beauty, she could assume a manner rather suggestive of a sultana than of the shrewd woman of business, or of the chaste huntress of mythology. Whether she actually took part or not in the disorders for which her Court was notorious, she was certainly at no pains to purify its moral atmosphere. It is well known that at one period she gave herself up to divination and sorcery under the guidance of the Italian, Fregoso. Brantôme, who drew a vivid, if somewhat imaginative picture of the Queen Mother surrounded by the wit and beauty of the ladies of her Court, compares her with them to a brilliant constellation in a clear sky. The Court was brilliant enough, but the sky was by no means cloudless.

The Huguenots, as might be expected, dissatisfied, suspicious of Catherine, had no intention of accepting their actual position as final, though they had attained to a power in the State beyond what had once been their fondest dream. Recent events in the Netherlands were not calculated to teach them submission, and like the demagogues of the present day, their leaders were careful to fan the flames of discontent by telling the poor among them how miserable they were, how cruel the

taxes, and how different their lot would be in a total overthrow of the established order of things.

Another language was of course held to the nobles. They were reminded of the ancient glory of France, which it behoved them to revive; and it was adroitly insinuated that although kings were mortal, the kingly office need never die out in France, while monarchs could be recruited from their midst. This tone concealed a plot, and the plot was nothing less bold than to seize the King, dethrone him and put Condé in his place.* Condé's bearing had already become openly insolent. He not only called upon Charles with imperious persistence to declare war against Spain, in defence of the rebels in the Netherlands, but when the King refused, he replied haughtily that he would himself in a few days raise an army of four or five thousand horse, wherewith to make a beginning.

On the vigil of the Feast of St. Michael, 1567, Charles was awakened at midnight in the castle of Monceau, with the news that a band of mounted insurgents, under the command of Admiral Coligny and de Genlis, had crossed the Marne, and were advancing rapidly towards the place, in order to effect his capture. There was only just time to reach Meaux in safety. Here a conference was held with the Huguenot chiefs, and Charles IX. showed that he had the stuff in him of which great and noble kings are made, and that if the qualities with which Providence had endowed him had been allowed free scope to develop, his might not have been least among the honoured names of history. But the delay occasioned by the conference nearly proved fatal to his freedom, and while General Pfeiffer with a few companies of Swiss Guards was hastening to his help, he was being gradually hemmed in on every side. Moved by the devotion of the little army of rescue who offered to escort him to Paris, although their ever reaching it seemed next to an impossibility, Charles drew his sword declaring that he would rather die as a king than live a captive, and pushing through a country infested by the rebels, continually surprised, intercepted and harassed by them, he arrived with his handful of troops to within a few leagues of his capital. Here he was met by reinforcements commanded by the Duke d'Aumale.

* "Mézeray," vol. iii. p. 157. Nat. Arch., Paris. K. 1507³³.

The plot to capture him had failed, but he was heard to declare that he would never forgive the Huguenots their treachery.* It would at least have been well if he had remembered of what they were capable, and had guarded his interests better in the sequel.

Catherine, vacillating even at this juncture, offered the traitors an amnesty if they would lay down their arms in the course of twenty-four hours. But they would listen to no terms, and on the 2nd October, Coligny occupied St. Denis with his army. Condé had hoped to welcome a contingent of English troops, but having received intelligence that Elizabeth would only furnish him with three hundred archers from among the Flemish refugees who had landed at Sandwich, he hastened from Boulogne to join the bulk of the Huguenot forces. He was received at St. Denis with acclamation. His first act was to set up barricades, so that no person might penetrate without leave into the ancient abbey, where a long line of French kings had been crowned and anointed. Here, in the presence of a few comrades, he placed upon his own head the crown of St. Louis, and caused himself to be proclaimed "Louis XIII., by the grace of God, first King of the faithful followers of the Gospel." On the 7th October coin was circulated bearing the same device.†

The Constable of France, Anne de Montmorency, in command of the royal army, sent a herald in the King's name, summoning him to retire. Condé received the herald at the entrance to his lodging with these words: "If you dare to pronounce the word rebellion, I will have you hanged above this door!"‡ But notwithstanding this proud attitude, experience had taught him that he could not hope to hold his ground without allies, and once more his hopes were centred in Elizabeth. Her sympathy with the "Beggars" of the Netherlands led their brethren in France to believe that when the decisive moment came she would follow up her promises with substantial help. Condé therefore wrote her a long letter,

* Brantôme, vol. v. p. 267. Nat. Arch., Paris. K. 1508.

† Le Frère, p. 239. Brantôme, vol. iv. p. 343. See also a letter from the Duke of Alva to Chantonnay, "Le Prince de Condé s'est fait appeler roi Louis XIII. par le peuple de Saint Denis, battant monnaie et faissant autres actes de souveraineté."

‡ Letter of Don Francis Alava. Nat. Arch., Paris. K. 1508.

claiming her support and seeking to justify the insurrection. "Were not," he said, "the early Christians persecuted as the enemies of Cæsar? And was not the cause of the Huguenots identical with theirs, the cause of the Gospel?" But lest this reason should not seem potent enough to Elizabeth's practical mind, he was careful to let her know that if she helped them she should not be forgotten in the parcelling out of the soil of France. Elizabeth was however menaced by the arrival of a Spanish army in the Netherlands, and she declined to take part in this second civil war. Perhaps also a natural grudge against Condé for his former desertion may have influenced her refusal.

Nor was the attempt to secure the co-operation of the Prince of Orange more successful, although the Huguenot camp was strengthened by the arrival of a few of the boldest and most enterprising of the *Gueux*, and Condé perhaps affected an assurance that he did not feel, when he declared that before a month had passed he would march into the Low Countries and deliver his friends from Spanish thralldom. Meanwhile, Catherine, in spite of her reluctance to call in Philip's aid, had obtained a promise of help from him, and on the 4th October the Duke of Alva announced that he had received instructions to march to the rescue of the King of France, the Queen Regent having solemnly engaged to have done for ever with all fellowship with the enemies of the Catholic religion in France.* The Guises on their part, knowing how little reliance could be placed on Catherine's adhesion to any one line of policy, and desiring at all costs to secure the friendship of Spain, offered the reversion of the crown to Philip II. in the event of Charles IX. dying without issue. Such an arrangement was less extraordinary than at first appears, for if the Salic law were set aside by a recourse to arms, as it so easily might be, Philip would have serious pretensions to that crown through his wife Elizabeth of France, sister of the French king.

Matters being thus arranged, the Spanish contingent, consisting of fifteen hundred horse and two thousand foot soldiers, entered France. These numbers, although small, obliged

* Documents inédits, vol. iv. pp. 465, 470.

Condé to divide his army, in order to defend the bridge at Poissy, and thus he weakened himself considerably. On the 10th November was fought the bloody battle of Saint Denis, the result of which was to drive the Huguenots from the banks of the Seine, and to make their designs upon the Low Countries impossible. In this battle was seen the strange sight of a Prince of the Church fighting on the side of heresy and rebellion. This was Cardinal de Châtillon, Bishop of Beauvais, Coligny's brother, who having joined the Huguenots, continued to wear the purple in order to retain his rank in the Council Chamber. The victory was undisputed, but Charles was unable to prevent Condé from besieging Chartres, although the self-made king had no money wherewith to pay his soldiers, who began to murmur loudly. He was at length forced to treat with Catherine, who as usual, instead of profiting by the advantages she had gained, was willing to accept any condition he chose to dictate.

Thus the shameful Peace of Chartres was signed on the 23rd March, and the only concession required of Condé was that he should lay down the royalty he had assumed. With this understanding, the King declared him to be his "good cousin and faithful servant," and his followers were not only to have all their rights and privileges restored to them, but were to be styled "faithful and loving subjects." To complete the folly and humiliation, Charles undertook to pay the German Reiters who had invaded his kingdom and had fought with his rebellious subjects against him.

The blindest optimism could scarcely have expected a durable peace to grow out of such a grovelling policy as this. The Peace of Chartres lasted but a few months. The Huguenots considered it little more than a momentary suspension of hostilities, and they did not even disarm. Not only moreover, did they retain certain of the towns they had agreed to surrender, but fortified themselves in La Rochelle, henceforth the capital of Huguenot France.

Philip II., disgusted with the terms of the treaty, declared that he was no longer the ally of the French King; whereupon the Prince of Orange entering France to support the Huguenots, the scale again rose in their favour. It was reported that they had decreed the death of the Queen

Mother, a crime which we may describe in their own language as unnecessary, since intentionally or not, she had ever proved herself their best friend.

Condé was now in a better position for securing Elizabeth's help, and he again wrote to her saying that he counted on a continuance of her favour for the furtherance of so good and holy a cause.* Cecil replied by ordering the English ambassador to negotiate with the chiefs of the Huguenots with a view to the intervention of England; and on the 6th December, 1568, a treaty was concluded between Elizabeth and the Prince of Condé, to the effect that she would lend him her aid in return for the salt and salt springs of Saintonge and the wool of the Poitou sheep, together with the metal of all bells torn down from the churches and monasteries.† In the following July Elizabeth handed over 20,000 pounds sterling to the Cardinal de Châtillon, for the acknowledged purpose of disseminating rebellion in France. The jewels of the Queen of Navarre were given to her as a security for the money.‡

The battle of Jarnac, so disastrous to the Huguenots, was fought on the 13th March, 1569. Condé was taken prisoner and then killed, in revenge for the death of the Marshal St. André, who was stabbed when a prisoner after the battle of Dreux. The Huguenots had seized Poitiers, but the energy of the Duke of Anjou drove them from that town, and they were again defeated in the famous battle of Moncontour. These victories were celebrated by the Royalists with a succession of brilliant fêtes and pageants.

"So much money is spent in balls and masquerades," said Tavannes, "that there is none left to pay the soldiers with."

Nevertheless, the insurgents were now thoroughly alarmed; with the loss of Condé it seemed as if the fortunes of war were turning against them, and they sent an imploring letter to Cecil.

"Help us," they wrote, "for we are the advanced guard of England!" §

* "Le XVIème siècle et les Valois," p. 234.

† Le Frère, p. 311. Castelnau, vol. vii. chap. ii. De Thou, vol. v. pp. 552 and 556.

‡ Lansdown MSS., 102, 80. B. M.

§ October 16, 1569. Record Office.

A sentence had been passed by the Parliament setting a price on Coligny's head, and this was renewed, but everything that was done to bring matters to a decisive issue was constantly stultified by Catherine's policy of playing off one party against the other.

It was Elizabeth's interest that no permanent peace should be established in France, and when Catherine proceeded as usual to court the vanquished in order to humble the victors, the Queen of England offered Coligny a subsidy of 25,000 crowns as the price of his consent not to treat with Charles.* The Cardinal de Châtillon, now an exile in England, also wrote to his brother entreating him not to separate himself from the English.

But Coligny knew well by experience that he could always make good terms for himself at home, and he assured the Queen Mother that she possessed no more affectionate servant than he was and always intended to be. A treaty was therefore again signed at St. Germain in spite of Elizabeth, and the Huguenots were declared good citizens, capable of occupying all public offices. The fortified towns of La Rochelle, Montauban, Cognac and La Charité were assigned to them. But scarcely was the treaty signed than a report was circulated to the effect that the Queen Mother was setting a trap by which the entire Huguenot body was to be exterminated. This supposed trap, called the "Royal Hunt," had, in reality, no other foundation than a remark made by Charles to Cardinal Rambouillet, the purport of which was that he had only made peace that he might save his crown, and that he was minded to follow another road by which one day he would cleanse his whole kingdom.†

Thus, although peace had been concluded, there was no peace. The Huguenots, practically the masters, seized a quantity of powder which the King was sending to St. Jean d'Angely, and carried it off to La Rochelle. Compromising letters were intercepted at Havre, written by Coligny to the Queen of England, and such was the universal panic that Charles on the eve of his marriage to Elizabeth of Austria,

* Letter from Don Francis Alava, June 17, 1570. Nat. Arch., Paris. K. 1515.

† "Mémoires de la Huguerie," vol. i. p. 9.

thought it prudent to prevent her further progress towards Paris, and went out to meet her at Mézières, where the ceremony took place. The state of public insecurity was no barrier to inordinate display and thoughtless rejoicings on this occasion. The King abandoned himself with a kind of frenzy to every extravagant device for his amusement.* The young Queen however, described by Alava as "an angel of goodness," was not deceived by these appearances, and it was remarked that her eyes constantly filled with tears, but that the King showed her little affection or regard.

It was about this time that the Duke of Anjou, under his mother's influence, and supported by Huguenot interests, appeared as an aspirant to the hand of Queen Elizabeth. There could have been little desire on his own part for such a marriage, for besides the disparity of their ages, he was madly in love with the beautiful Mademoiselle de Châteauneuf, at whose side he would pass whole weeks and months utterly oblivious of war or politics.†

He had moreover, long ceased to identify himself with the Protestants. "Le petit Huguenot" of his childhood, in spite of Catherine's system of education, had not developed into "le grand Huguenot," and added to these reasons, Catherine herself admitted that the Duke was the less willing to marry Elizabeth as he had always heard bad reports of her reputation.‡ A few weeks later Walsingham declared that the Duke seemed cold, undecided, and but little disposed towards a union, the trials and dangers of which he did not underrate. At the very moment when the marriage was publicly announced, it was in fact definitely broken off, and Walsingham informed Cecil that neither the threats of the King nor the entreaties of the Queen Mother had succeeded in making the Duke of Anjou conclude the match.§ He himself wrote to Elizabeth a letter in which he thanked her for her kindness, but regretted that so many difficulties opposed the accomplishment of what he would otherwise have so ardently desired.

* "Discours des noces du roi." Bib. Nat., Paris, f. fr. 20647.

† Harl. MSS., 253. B. M.

‡ "D'autant qu'il a toujours si mal oui parler de son honneur." Corr. de la Mothe. Lettre de Catherine de Medici, vol. vii.

§ Foreign Papers, July 27, 1571. R. O.

He ended by assuring her that she might always count on his feelings of devotion towards her.* Elizabeth never forgave him this insult, and three years afterwards she told Montgomery that if the Duke of Anjou became king she would dethrone him even if it cost her her crown.†

Meanwhile, the marriage of the King of Navarre with Margaret of Valois was to cement the Peace of St. Germain, by uniting the noblest Huguenot chief to a Catholic princess of the blood-royal. The bride had been affianced by Henry II. as a child to the Duke of Guise, who now in vain claimed her for his wife. Charles IX. informed the young Princess that unless she consented to a union with Henry of Navarre she would be imprisoned for life in a convent, and to this threat she yielded, hoping against hope that the refusal of the Pope to grant a dispensation would set her free at the last moment. Not only was the dispensation refused, but all means were employed to save her from a marriage which every sincere Catholic deplored. The Pope sent a special legate, Cardinal Alexandrini, to the King, with orders to spare neither entreaty nor remonstrance to avert the impending evil. But to every appeal Charles had but one reply: "It is my only means of taking vengeance on my enemies."

St. Francis Borgia at first appeared to be more successful in a like mission to Catherine. She assured him with the fervour she could so easily simulate that she would rather die than conclude her daughter's marriage without a dispensation.‡ Yet, although the dispensation was never granted, two successive Popes, Gregory XIII. and St. Pius V., having persistently refused it, the contract was signed on August 17, 1572. Charles was heard to say that he gave his sister, not merely to the Prince of Navarre, but to all the Huguenots in France that she might as it were espouse them all.

Two days later, the religious ceremony was performed outside the church of Notre Dame, a Papal despatch announcing the speedy arrival of the dispensation having been forged for the purpose of deceiving those whose consciences might otherwise have prevented their attendance. A vast platform had been

* Foreign Papers, July 31, 1571.

† Castelnau, "Memoirs," p. 414.

‡ Letters from Philip II. to Francis Borgia. Nat. Arch., Paris. K. 1526.

erected in front of the church for the celebration of the nuptials. The bride wore a splendid crown and a rich bodice of ermine ; her dress sparkled with jewels, and three princesses held up her train of royal blue velvet. But her face was sad, and she made no answer when she was asked whether she accepted the Prince of Navarre for her husband. Charles, however, stepping forward obliged her to bow her head in token of obedience, the only sign of assent that she gave.

Mass was then said inside the church, and Margaret was the only assistant.*

Coligny, in the meantime, had established himself in the old château of Blois, where he held a kind of court and kept up a semi-regal state, while Charles sought to propitiate him by heaping favour upon favour on him. "The King of France is acting like a madman," said Philip II., and certainly there was no reasonable explanation of his policy in thus flattering a man who it was known was again plotting to lay violent hands on him. In the month of June 1572, the Admiral had made a solemn entry into Paris, and had incited the Huguenots to an aggressive demonstration, the more irritating to the Catholic population, inasmuch as the day chosen for the event was the feast of Corpus Christi. He went straight to the château in the Bois de Boulogne where the King was then staying. As he entered the room Charles rose and advanced to meet him, folded him in his arms, and made him sit down by his side. "Never in all my reign," said he, "was any one more welcome to my Court."†

Since the death of Condé, the Guises had fallen into disgrace, and the Duke of Anjou, who befriended them, was also out of favour with Charles. Catherine, in spite of all her truckling policy, was once again and for always the object of Huguenot hatred, but, what was of far greater importance to her, she had entirely lost her influence with the King, who now listened to no advice but Coligny's. His primary object was to induce Charles to declare war against Philip, to send an army into the Netherlands, and after subjugating those provinces, to place the Duke of Anjou on the throne. This would have the double

* De Thou, l. lii.

† Cotton MSS. : Galba, C. IV, B. M.

advantage of driving the Catholic Spaniards out of the Low Countries, and of removing the Catholic Duke of Anjou from France. "If," said Coligny to the Duke, "the King does not carry war into the Netherlands he will have it in France, and will not only be exposed to the hatred of Philip but to that of the Huguenots as well." * This threat was the refrain of all his conferences with Charles, and at last he told him that the Huguenots would no longer be fed with fine language; they demanded an answer within the space of four days. Six hundred horse and two thousand foot soldiers were all that they needed to become masters of the Netherlands. At first the King would promise nothing, but preparations for war were made as if he had consented, and a report was spread that he was about to conclude an alliance with the Turks against Spain. Upon this, the Duke of Alva lost no time, and when at length the Huguenot chief, De Genlis, crossed the frontier to join the Prince of Orange on the banks of the Meuse, Don Fabricius of Toledo, Alva's son, assailed and completely routed him.

The Parisians, groaning under the Huguenot tyranny, manifested the most tempestuous joy at this defeat. Banquets and bonfires were held in the streets. All Paris was in a state of delirium at the unexpected prospect of deliverance from the hated yoke. The good news spread like wildfire through the provinces, and the sudden change from the deepest gloom to hope and gladness was more eloquent than any words to describe what the sufferings of the great Catholic majority had been. It was also significant of what the frenzy of their despair would be, should the Huguenots again triumph.

The disappointment of the Duke of Anjou was even greater than Coligny's; he had counted on the crown of the Netherlands. As for Catherine, the Huguenot defeat caused her neither satisfaction nor regret. What to her was the joy or suffering of the nation compared with the paramount importance of her ambition! The King had become a mere tool in Coligny's hands, and his mother's influence over him was a thing of the past. To regain that lost power seemed to her the one all-sufficient reason for throwing herself definitely for once on the side opposed to the Huguenots. If Coligny were

* Letter of Petrucci, July 16, 1572. Paris.

allowed to live, his voice would henceforth be the only authoritative voice in France, and to silence it for ever was her one chance of regaining her former ascendancy over her son's mind.

At a secret council held at Monceau she confided to a few devoted friends the fact that a struggle to the death had begun between herself and the Admiral, and that she had resolved on his undoing. The blow was to be struck to the sound of marriage bells and under cover of the festivities following the union of the King of Navarre with Margaret of Valois. But even then it was to appear as if the Guises were responsible alone for the deed, lest it should become necessary for Catherine again to treat with the Huguenots. The Venetian ambassador was not however deceived by these carefully prepared appearances, and he exculpated the Guises from any share in the plot. "All this business," he wrote to the Doge, "has been the work of the Queen Mother from the beginning to the end, combined and directed by her; the Duke of Anjou has alone had any share in it."

But Michele, like any other contemporary, could only judge by what he saw of passing events. We have the advantage of seeing the whole canvas of the revolutionary picture unrolled before us, and know the parts each character played in the historical drama. But for Elizabeth and her ambassadors in France, the Huguenots would never have risen to be so dangerous an element in the State; and had it not been for the inhuman cruelties which they practised, Catherine's deed of blood would probably have been limited to one victim.

Coligny's answer to the public rejoicing over his defeat, was to place thirty pieces of artillery on the Place de Grève. Written orders had been sent to "those of the religion" to be in readiness, and from thirty to forty thousand armed men were awaiting his signal.* Nothing but the interminable feasting and revelry kept the bomb from exploding. Paris was swarming with adventurers of every kind, ready to increase and swell the confusion whenever the music should cease and the fighting begin. At the sight of the Huguenot cannon, intended to strike terror into their hearts, the Parisians were goaded to madness. It was three days before the massacre of St. Bartholomew.

J. M. STONE.

* "Corr. de Hainaut," vol. ix. Brussels, Arch.

ART. VII.—LORD MAR'S HOME RULE BILL.

THE Earl of Mar, who headed the Rebellion of 1715, is generally regarded by historians as having been a man of slender military capacity though of considerable parts as a statesman. Mr. Lockhart, the author of the famous *Memoirs*, who disliked and distrusted Mar, is unable to withhold from him the credit of having conducted the Pretender's affairs during the time he was in his service, more easily and successfully than any of the Prince's subsequent favourites. Lord Mahon says of him in his *History*: "He was a man of great activity, judgment, and address, but no knowledge of war; at home in court cabals, but, as we shall afterwards find, unskilful and helpless in a camp." "The Earl of Mar," says Lord John Russell in his *Memoirs of the Affairs of Europe*, "was a man of quick talents, interested disposition, restless in his temper, inordinate in his ambition." "A man," says Marshall Berwick, writing of the events of 1715, "may have a great deal of understanding, a great deal of personal bravery, and be a very able Minister without having the talents requisite for an enterprise of this nature. It is certain that Mar had them not, and we must not therefore wonder that he did not succeed."

When the Jacobite Rebellion of 1715 was at an end, Mar accompanied the Pretender to France, where, upon the dismissal of Bolingbroke, he was made chief minister or chief secretary to Prince James in the room of the former. Mar enjoyed the favour of the Pretender for some years; at last, however, he was driven from office (1724) by Bishop Atterbury and Hay, afterwards titular Earl of Inverness. It will doubtless be recollected that the former had been compelled to leave England in 1721 on account of a Jacobite conspiracy in which he and other prominent personages this side the English Channel were involved. Atterbury attributed his banishment to Mar, who, he alleged, had sold information to the British Government which directly incriminated him. The whole transaction, however which led to the expulsion of Atterbury is involved in so much mystery that it is quite impossible to say at this distance of time whether or no the bishop had adequate grounds for his

suspicious. As against the suspicions entertained by the bishop with regard to Lord Mar, it is, however, but just to mention the fact that Atterbury was only found guilty after a protracted trial, and after the most determined efforts on the part of the prosecution to secure a verdict in favour of the Hanoverian Government had been made by the law officers of the Crown—a circumstance which would hardly have been allowed to happen had Mar and the Government conspired together to set a trap for the bishop.

However that may be, Atterbury, from the circumstance of his banishment, conceived a lasting resentment against Mar. And when the latter presented to the Regent of France in 1723 a scheme by which Scotland and Ireland were to be made independent of England, and to a certain extent dependent on France, the bishop, who hated Mar and the Scots almost as much as he did the Irish, contrived to procure a copy of the Memorial, and sent it to England to be printed. The publication and distribution of the Memorial in Jacobite circles in England, besides raising a great storm of indignation against Mar, served the sinister purposes of Atterbury as well by forcing in a measure the Pretender's hand, who, to save himself from the odium of having extended his approbation to a scheme so derogatory to England, dismissed his Minister from office. The conduct of the Pretender with regard to this affair of Mar's Memorial is particularly reprehensible, inasmuch as he had previously given his consent and approbation to an identical scheme, likewise the work of Mar's hand, by which Scotland and Ireland were to be restored to their ancient rights and liberties, and made independent of England. This previous scheme or Memorial, which relates to Scotland, I am about to publish elsewhere. What, however, I have called "Lord Mar's Home Rule Bill," I propose, with the reader's permission, to reproduce in this place, from the original MS. now temporarily in my possession :—

CONSIDERATIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR IRLAND ON A RESTORATION.

July 1722.

1. The Parl. and Kingdome of Irland to be declared in the most solemne and authentick maner free and independant of all but the King himself and his lawfull heirs and successors, and Poinings Act etc. to be anuled.

2. The Parl. to consist as now of an House of Lords and another of Comoners, and all acts and laus to be past by the Parl. of Irland only, with the consent of the King or his Ld. Livetenant, without being revised by the Councill of England and no sentance or order of either or both Houses of the English Parl. to be of any force in Irland.

3. A new Parl. to be called every seven years and to meet once in two years at least.

4. No Peer of England to be capable of being a peer of Irland unless he renounce his English Peerage.

5. All the officers of state and civill goverment to be named by the king out of lists to be recomended by Parl. of three for each office and these to hold their places no longer than seven years, unless recomended again by Parl.

6. The Judges and Bishops to be named and hold their places in the same maner as is proposed for Scotland (that is to say they are to be named by the King out of lists prepared by Parliament which, in the case of the Bishops, must have been previously prepared by the clergy themselves).

7. Not to be in the King's power to make peace or war for the kingdome of Irland but by the consent of Parl.

8. The Militia to be regulated and estcablished by the King and Parl. conforme to the way proposed for Scotland (that is to say all the common people are to be enroled as members, and commanders to be appointed over them to hold their commissions of the King, by and with the consent of Parliament).

9. The Esteablished Church of Irland and its goverment to be as now by Bishops, Arch Bishops, &c., but liberty of contience to be allow'd to all to worships God in their own way, and no exclusion to be on any one, on account of religion, from Parl. or any publick employment.

10. A comission to be appointed by King and Parl. for regulating the affair of the fforfitours, so that all since the Revolution may be restored to their ancient properties, on such conditions as the Parl. shall by an Act appoint.

11. The trade of the kingdome to be regulated and esteablished as the Parl. shall judge fit.

12. A good corespondance to be esteablished betwixt Irland and Scotland and ways taken to encourage it, as giveing Scotsmen the same priviledges in Irland as Irishmen shall have in Scotland, and the trade betwixt the two countrys to be regulated for the advantage of both.

13. An agreement to be made betuixt the king and the kings of france and spain for each of those kings entertaining in their service 5000 Irish troops, as is proposed betwixt Scotland and france.

14. Ministers or Envoys from the king on the part of Irland to be kept at fforeigne courts and recomended to the King by the Parl. of Irland as is proposed for Scotland.

15. Twelve thousand regular troops to be kept always on foot in Irland.

16. A competent navie or fleet to be always entertained for protecting the trade of the kingdome, &c.

17. Tilage to be encouraged for the better peopleing the country, and sheep waks or pastur to be restricted by allowing only a certain and reasonable number of sheep to each tennant or farmer conforme to the extent of his grounds.

18. The Linnen Manufactur to be regulated as found most for the interest of the country, and the propogating of hemp (for which a great part of the kingdome is exceeding proper) and the manufacturs of sail cloath and cordage to be encouraged.

To attempt any elaborate criticism of this far-reaching scheme of Home Rule would be practically to raise a discussion on the principle of Home Rule, a step which I am neither at liberty nor willing to take in this place. I may perhaps, however, be permitted to offer a few remarks on those articles of the memorial which in my opinion are most deserving of notice.

Article 9, which deals with the "Esteablished Church" and liberty of "contience" reflects, it seems to me, great credit on its author. At a time when comparatively few men in Ireland were at liberty to worship God as they desired, and the Church of the bulk of the people was subjected to the most cruel and vexatious restrictions, it is indeed a pleasure to encounter a British statesman who, while stipulating for the continuance of the "Esteablished Church," is yet wise enough and humane enough to impress on his King the duty and necessity of allowing perfect liberty of conscience to all. "And," to quote the notable words of the article itself, "*no exclusion to be on any one, on account of religion, from Parl. or any publick emploiment.*" With respect to article 12, Lord Mar was always particularly anxious that the Scots and Irish nations should be good friends. "They are come," he says in one part of his MS., "of the same stock," and he considered it as but right and proper that a "good correspondence" should be established between two nations which stand in so intimate a degree of blood-relationship to one another. In another part of his MS. he speaks strongly in favour of a federal union between Scotland and Ireland.

Article 13 requires a little explanation, as it really refers to provision in his Home Rule Scheme for Scotland, whereby a certain number of Scots troops (5 or 10 thousand in all)

were to be constantly entertained in the service of the French king. Mar's idea was to unite Scotland, Ireland, and, to all military intents and purposes, France, together in one powerful armed confederacy so as to enable the King of Great Britain and Ireland, in the event of his being so unfortunate as to quarrel with his *English subjects* alone, to nip rebellion in the bud, as it were, by employing against them the combined standing armies of both Scotland and Ireland, as well as the Scots and Irish troops in the service of France. As Spain was Ireland's ancient friend and ally, he thought it but just that the latter country should provide 5000 Irish troops for the Spanish service as well, not forgetting of course that the natural result of this arrangement would be to incline the balance still more against the English people and Parliament.

Articles 16, 17, 18 bear testimony to their author's sincerity and good intentions, though I am afraid that 17 and 18 contain some shocking economic heresies. The idea of "regulating" the "linnen manufactur" and of allowing only a certain number of sheep to each farmer "conforme to the extent of his grounds" is no doubt just what might have been expected in an age and from one of a race of statesmen that looked habitually to Parliament and the laws (which is precisely what the Socialists are doing at the present day) to "regulate" the industries of the nation, from the highest and most important down to the smallest and most insignificant particulars.

STUART ERSKINE.

ART. VIII.—THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH AND THE SEE OF PETER.*

THE Anglican appeal to antiquity has been very vigorously urged by some recent writers, and the Primitive Saints have been summoned to bear witness against the See of Rome. For this reason, Father Rivington's new work on the "Primitive Church and the See of Peter" is doubly welcome. As the title itself suggests, it is in some sense a counterblast to Mr. Puller's "Primitive Saints and the See of Rome." But it is by no means a mere answer to that able Anglican advocate. As a critic, Father Rivington has already dealt with Mr. Puller in the pages of this REVIEW. In the work before us, he has occasion to correct several mistakes of the same writer and other eminent Anglicans, notably Canon Bright and Dr. Salmon. But, as far as possible, this merely controversial matter subsides into footnotes or recedes into appendices. The main body of the book affords an answer of another kind. Instead of mere negative criticism of the doctrine ascribed to the primitive fathers, we are given a luminous exposition of their real teaching. It is a positive answer, like that which the great Cardinal gave when he told the true story of his life, because, as he said himself, "false ideas may be indeed refuted by argument, but by true ideas alone are they expelled." This is, indeed, the real meaning of Father Rivington's valuable work. To see this, we have only to put aside all incidental references to the difficulties and objections of our opponents, and all introductory passages and explanatory annotations, and look at what then remains. It is a series of luminous facts, that speak for themselves and are rightly left to tell their own tale. Let us set them down here in our author's own order: St. Clement's magisterial letter to the Corinthians, the testimony of St. Irenæus, St. Victor's display of world-wide authority, St. Stephen's judicial action in hearing appeals and his

* "The Primitive Church and the See of Peter," by the Rev. Luke Rivington, M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford. With an Introduction by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1894.

vindication of the true tradition on baptism, St. Cyprian's teaching on the primacy, St. Dionysius of Alexandria writing to Rome for guidance "so that he might not err," and submitting to the authority of the Pope of his name, St. Sylvester sending his legates to Nicæa showing himself, as the Græco-Russian Liturgy has it, "the supreme one of the Sacred Council," St. Julius shielding St. Athanasius, St. Liberius revoking Rimini, St. Damasus defining the divinity of the Holy Spirit, St. Innocent writing the rescripts that finish the cause of the Pelagians, St. Celestine with St. Cyril saving the truth assailed by Nestorius, and, finally, St. Leo speaking at Chalcedon with the voice of Peter. Such are some of the foremost facts that form the main matter of the book. What the author has done is to set them forth clearly and succinctly, with just enough in the way of circumstantial description to throw them well into the light and enable us to feel their full force and meaning.

We take any one by itself, as it stands in Father Rivington's pages, and we see that in this particular action or utterance of one of the early popes, or this witness of the Church receiving his words and accepting his ruling, we have a plain fact in favour of the Papal Primacy. There is considerable difference in the evidence thus afforded, in some cases strong and clear, in others the truth is rather implied or hinted at. Still each one has a real worth of its own. But the force of all is further enhanced, when we take them, as we surely should, together. It is only by an unreasonable isolation that it is possible to miss their meaning and explain them away. The evidence is cumulative, and as such is overwhelming. We feel that there is a wondrous unity in these varying voices from the early Church. The self-same truth is borne in upon us from all sides, from Rome itself, from Gaul and Africa and the East, from the clear note of Clement and the stray words of Stephen to the richer and fuller tones of Celestine and Leo. And besides the fresh force felt in this unison, each individual witness is strengthened and made plainer by the light reflected from the rest. The authoritative action of the earlier popes finds its explanation in the language held by St. Leo or the legates at Ephesus. And this in its turn is borne out and corroborated by the older evidence. Even in the short space

covered by the present volume, we may see the working of the great principle of doctrinal development. The doctrine of the Papal *Magisterium* is set forth more fully at Ephesus and Chalcedon, but its presence is felt from the very first.

In his preface, Father Rivington dwells on the importance of this principle, and speaks of Mr. Puller's repudiation of its necessity as the chief blot in his book. And he appeals to St. Vincent of Lerins as a proof that the theory of development was not unknown in the fifth century. Readers who have the advantage of being familiar with Dr. Ward's "Ideal of a Christian Church," will be reminded of a passage in which Mr. Palmer's attack on this "modern theory" is very effectively answered by a quotation from the same saint.* While much of the evidence here put together may be seen in earlier writers on the primacy, there are some points which have been hitherto overlooked, and some records that have only leapt to light in recent years. The valuable epistle of St. Clement with which the volume opens, only found its way into the West in the seventeenth century. So much is sometimes said about Roman fraud and forgery that we may be pardoned for dwelling on the fact that this earliest documentary evidence for Papal authority comes to us entirely through Eastern and English hands. We first find the text of the letter in the famous *Codex Alexandrinus*, the gift of a Greek patriarch to an English king. Some six chapters were missing from this venerable copy, and these have been found and published within the last twenty years by the Greek scholar, Bryennios, now Patriarch of Nicomedia. Let us hear Father Rivington on this important letter—

In the very first document belonging to Christian history, outside the pages of Holy Scripture, the Church of Rome steps to the front in a manner that is suggestive of supreme authority, and that tallies with her whole future attitude towards the rest of the Church. The occupant of the See of Rome comes before us, speaking in the name of his Church, within the lifetime of the Apostle St. John, and settles a disturbance in a region naturally more nearly related to that Apostle than to the Church of Rome. And he comes before us both as in possession of a tradition of divine truth, and as its authoritative exponent to a distant Church. He lays down the law of worship and government for the whole Church as of divine institution (p. 1).

* P. 128, 1st edition.

He magisterially reproves the ringleaders of the disturbances in Corinth for attempting to extrude such successors of the Apostles, and says that "it will be a sin in us" to depose them from their "sacred office." Further on, in a passage only discovered of late, he claims their "obedience unto the things written by us through the Holy Spirit" (§ 63), as he had said a little previously, "If any disobey the things spoken by Him through us, let them know that they will involve themselves in transgression and no small peril" (§ 59, p. 2).

Before leaving the subject of St. Clement, Father Rivington devotes some pages to the strange story of the Clementine Romance, and the still stranger use to which it has been put by some Anglican writers, who seek to make it the real origin of the Papal claims.

If the author of the Clementine Romance [says Mr. Puller], had not been an Ebionitish heretic, with an inherited hatred of the memory of St. Paul, the world would never have heard of the chair of Peter. It is strange how, from the very first, the Roman claims have been based upon forgeries ("Primitive Saints," p. 50).

Had this confident assertion been backed by some show of argument, the task of answering it would have been somewhat simpler. But even Dr. Lightfoot, *pace tanti viri*, vouchsafes no reason for a like statement. "I would gladly give this author's proof," says Father Rivington, "but I have been unable to find anything but assertion on this whole subject" (p. 14). Gratuitous assertions, as we all know, may be met in kind; but our author has taken a more generous course. He gives what many will consider convincing proof that the Clementine literature only came to Rome in the third century, too late to do the work assigned to it by the Anglican theory. But some of the light here thrown on the age of the "Recognitions" is not quite so new as he would seem to imply. Good reason for connecting Bardesanes with Elagabalus, and putting the "Recognitions" at least as late as Caracalla, was already given by Gallandius in the last century.

But before dealing with the facts and figures, our author draws attention to the great improbability of the alleged change. Having cited some Anglican admissions as to the honorary primacy and the practical goodness of the Roman Church, he says :

Was, then, the Church of Rome, the leading Church according to all

these writers, so filled with the spirit of lying that she could take the suggestion of a romance in place of her own lists, which we know from Hegesippus she then possessed, whether by oral tradition or in writing? Had she the heart to alter her tale to drop the Apostle in whom she had gloried, and in whom, conjointly with St. Peter, she glories to-day, sending out her bulls in their twin name?—had she, I say, the heart suddenly to change her attitude towards her known and loved founder? Did Tertullian, when he came to Rome, instead of examining the lists, instead of listening to what older men could tell him, take up with an incidental expression in a romance, which *no single writer of that time ever quoted*, so far as our records go, as an authority, and of which they rejected the heretical teaching, according to Dr. Salmon? Could all classes in the Church of Rome agree suddenly on a new platform, and no whisper of the fundamental change find its way outside, or produce the slightest protest against this change in the Church's idea of her own constitution? (p. 16).

From a careful consideration of the available evidence in Eusebius, St. Irenæus and St. Epiphanius, our author gathers that—

whilst the See of Rome was founded by the two Apostles Peter and Paul, it was also in a special sense the See of Peter, that (ii.) so far as we can glean anything positive from Eusebius about the list of the Bishops of Rome, drawn up by Hegesippus in the middle of the second century, it also included a special relationship of St. Peter to the See; and that (iii.) Tertullian, after or during his visit to Rome, wrote as an ascertained fact that St. Clement was ordained by St. Peter, although he does not say that he was immediate successor; that (iv.) the Clementine literature reached Rome after Tertullian had left; and that (v.) in its Western dress it wove into its tale the common tradition of the West to which Tertullian had made allusion (p. 30).

To the passages from Eusebius in which the Popes are numbered from St. Peter alone, it might be well to add the fragment from Hippolytus quoted by the historian at the close of his Fifth Book. In a supplementary note to this chapter, Father Rivington mentions an explanation of the popularity of the Clementine literature suggested by Dr. Bigg in the "Studia Biblica." Some of the statements quoted, however, are more than mere conjecture. We have the authority of the contemporary Hippolytus for the fact that Alcibiades (not Alexander) of Apamæa came to Rome with his new Gospel given by an angel ninety-six miles high, and put forth his teaching on Baptism as an improvement on the lenient line taken by St. Callistus.*

* "Philosophum," ix. 13, ed. Miller, p. 292.

After St. Clement's letter, we have a chapter on the well-known witness of St. Irenæus in the second century. In meeting the difficulties raised as to the meaning of this passage, Father Rivington does not feel it necessary to insist on the rendering of *convenire ad* by "agree with" rather than "have recourse to." And in this we think he is well advised. At the same time, he takes care to add that—

it must be remembered that it is to the Church, not to the City of Rome that this centripetal movement is said to be "of necessity." And it is every *Church* which must resort to the Church of Rome. The following words—"those who are from all sides"—explain, but must not be allowed to explain away, the word Church (p. 34).

And he scouts the notion that the coming together of men from all quarters could be the means of keeping Rome right. "The mere fact of a confluence of streams will not keep the waters sweet: there must be some preservative power in the centre."

These words of sound sense will be enough, we would fain hope, to satisfy many who have been misled or bewildered by the ingenious glosses of some recent writers. But the matter is so important that it may not be amiss to see what can be done by approaching the question in another way. Let us put aside all the disputed words and phrases, and look simply at the logic of St. Irenæus. What is the scope of the whole passage? The saint is showing how the true tradition comes to us from the Apostles, handed down through those to whom they entrusted the charge of the churches. If, he argues against the heretics, the Apostles taught your hidden mysteries, they would have imparted them to those with whom they left the care of the churches. To these, therefore, and to their successors, we must betake ourselves to see whether your teaching is Apostolic. And he boldly says that these all taught nothing like the Valentinian dreams. To make good his point he must give a list of all the Bishops appointed by the Apostles, and trace their successors down to his own day. Instead of doing this, however, he contents himself with giving the succession of one single Church, the Church of Rome. This might well seem somewhat incomplete. But the saint says, notwithstanding, that his proof is most full: *et est*

plenissima haec ostensio. How can it be full when only one Church is taken, unless that Church has the right to speak for all? The argument would fall through if this were not the case, for one of the other churches might have handed down a traditionary mystery somehow neglected here. Accordingly the saint, before giving his list of Popes, has taken pains to show that Rome is enough, as she is the centre and standard of all. It cannot be that he is resting this pre-eminence on the fact that Christians from other churches flock to Rome, for he has not given the succession of other churches and can hardly appeal to their authority. And throughout the whole passage the appeal is clearly to accredited teachers who come from the Apostles in unbroken succession. But this was scarcely the position of those who happened to be drawn to the capital in the train of the court or the tide of trade. Whatever *convenire* may mean here, in his next chapter the saint certainly does speak of going, or having recourse, to the Apostolic Churches, but it is to learn of them not to teach them.*

These greater churches were so many centres radiating light to the lesser sees around them, thus keeping them safe in the true tradition. Hence, to know the faith of a whole province, it would be enough to find the teaching of the central see from which its churches depended. But Rome, and this is the saint's point here, is something more than the others, it is the common centre wherein the faithful from all parts of the habitable world are kept in the true tradition. This is clearly the drift of the argument, even if we take *principalitas* to mean the civil position of the city, and *convenire* the natural trend of trade. In any case there *was* this concourse to the capital, with the result that the most distant lands learnt what was taught in Rome. St. Leo, in a well-known passage, gives this as a reason why St. Peter went there. But when once we see that St. Irenæus is arguing from the pre-eminent position of the Church, it is surely more natural to take *potior principalitas* as referring to the spiritual capital. Indeed, it is the very phrase that the whole context suggests.

* Cf. Tertullian, "De Praescript. Haereticorum," c. 36, "S. Irenæus Advers. Haeres." lib. iii. c. 4, Möhler, "Patrologie," p. 353.

The Apostolic sees are the chief or principal churches, but Rome has a higher origin and a more powerful sway.*

St. Irenæus is not treating directly of the Papal prerogative, but of Apostolic tradition. And he says no more than the argument in hand requires. Nevertheless, the whole Vatican definition is implied in this classic passage. It only needs to be unfolded by that theological development, for which this saint himself is the earliest authority.†

From St. Irenæus, Father Rivington passes on to the vigorous action of St. Victor in the Easter controversy. It was surely a striking display of the Papal power in that early age. Finding that certain churches of Asia refused to adopt the Paschal practice agreed on by the rest, the Pope decided or threatened to cut them off from the common unity, and issued an edict declaring them altogether cut off. This, as our author considers, was probably conditional on their conduct at the following Easter. Owing to the vigorous protests of some Eastern Bishops, and still more to the timely mediation of St. Irenæus, the threatened separation was avoided. But this opposition only serves to show the Papal power more plainly.

Not a hint is given all round [says our author] that any one of the churches disputed St. Victor's authority. Had any other portion of the Church talked of cutting off whole churches from the common unity, it would only have made itself ridiculous. But when the threat comes from Rome the whole Church is astir; and there is one thing that no one says—neither St. Irenæus nor the rest of the Bishops said, It is ridiculous you have no such authority; but they exhort, and protest, and warn and entreat him not to do so (p. 43).

In correcting Mr. Puller's account of the matter, our author points out that he has inverted the words of Eusebius in summing up the Pope's proceedings, as if St. Victor had first declared the Asiatics cut off from Rome and then tried to sever them from the common unity. But it is only fair to Mr. Puller to say that he has previously given the passage

* Cf. St. Cyprian's "*Ecclesia principalis*," and the "*auctoritate quoque optiore aeterni urbis episcopi*" of Ammianus Marcellinus, xv. 7.

† See his words in the Preface to the First Book: "*Ea quae tibi cum dilectione scripta sunt, cum dilectione percipies, et ipse augeas ea penes te, ut magis idoneus quam nos, quasi semen et initia accipiens a nobis.*"

from Eusebius in full, so that his readers can see for themselves. And though he is surely mistaken in distinguishing between the severance from Roman communion and from the common unity, he is not without support in this.* Father Rivington does well to confirm his reading of the Pope's magisterial action by a striking passage from Professor Harnack. Readers of this REVIEW will remember the good service this eminent Protestant scholar has done to the memory of St. Victor by vindicating his claim to the authorship of the pseudo-Cyprianic treatise *De Aleatoribus*.† To the witness of Harnack, we might add the emphatic pronouncement of Schweigler, a distinguished writer of the Tübingen critical school, that in Victor's episcopate "all the factors of the Papacy are present."‡

As might be expected, St Cyprian fills a large place in Father Rivington's volume. While one chapter was enough for each of the foregoing subjects, no less than four are devoted to the twofold task of elucidating St. Cyprian's evidence, and meeting the difficulties arising from his mistaken action. Both are admirably done. On the one hand, the author brings out the full force of such significant passages as that in which the saint complains that the Novatians "dare to set sail and to carry letters from schismatic and profane persons *to the chair of Peter*, and to the principal [or ruling] Church, whence episcopal unity has taken its rise."§ These words, by the way, throw a strong light on the saint's teaching elsewhere on the relation of St. Peter to the episcopate, and confirm the Catholic interpretation maintained by our author. On the Anglican hypothesis that St. Peter was merely a type of the unity of each individual diocese, there would be no meaning in this reference to Rome as the place "whence episcopal unity has taken its rise."

For the controversy on Baptism, Father Rivington makes good use of St. Augustine's evidence; and reminds us that our knowledge of the facts is far from being complete.

* Cf. Dom Massuet, *Op. S., Irenaei, Pars ii., Diss. ii., n. 22.*

† See Father Ryder's able article on this subject, *DUBLIN REVIEW*, July 1889.

‡ "Nachapostolisch. Zeitalter, ii., s. 214.

§ *Epist. lix., Oxford, and ed. Hartel; lv. ed. Benedict.*

St. Cyprian, he says, fought against a particular exercise of authority, not the authority in principle; but for aught we know he ended by recognising the security of its shelter even in this matter. His can hardly be a test case, because history deserts us at the critical point (p. 115).

The chapter ends with an effective passage from Monsignor Freppel, which sums up the matter "from a controversial point of view." May we refer our readers to another writer well worthy the attention of all whose minds are exercised by the Cyprianic question? The stress of controversial strife has given such painful prominence to this portion of the saint's career, that our theologians are somewhat apt to dwell on it at disproportionate length, and adopt a too apologetic or critical tone in speaking of the great African Father. For this reason it is refreshing to turn from the dispute to those glowing pages in which this "Ignatius of the West" is pictured for us by Möhler's master hand. Here, the difficulties are touched on in passing and fall into their proper place, powerless to mar the beauty of the whole, lost in the light of his faith and the fire of his burning zeal.*

The ninth chapter, which completes and sums up the evidence of the first period (A.D. 96–300), is one of the best in the book. Here the author dwells on the palmary instance of Papal authority afforded by Pope St. Dionysius when he reviewed the teaching of his great namesake of Alexandria, and the Patriarch of the second see clearly recognised the justice of his claim. Nor was this all. As Father Rivington points out, St. Athanasius takes the authoritative utterance of this Pope as evidence that the error afterwards revived by Arius was already "long since anathematised by all."† A somewhat sweeping conclusion to draw from the witness of one Bishop; but, for St. Athanasius, as for St. Irenæus before him, the faith of Rome was the faith of all. As a fitting pendant to this witness from Alexandria, we have Aurelian's reference of the Antiochene dispute to the Bishops of Italy. This, as our author observes, cannot be set aside as a mere instance of imperial centralisation, for the heathen emperor

* "Patrologie," pp. 809–93. "Nur ein von vornherin befangenes Urtheil konnte jenes vorübergehende beiderseits entschuld bare Missverhältniss zum Nachtheil des kirchlichen Primates auszubeuten, sich versucht und gedungen fühlen," p. 870.

† De Sententia Dionysii.

would not have sought to appease the Bishops by an award that was contrary to their own ideas. The meaning of these two instances is made more plain when we remember the position held by these sees in the primitive hierarchy. As Father Rivington says in introducing this subject :

The Church, then, was not as some seem to imagine, all but invertebrate in the third century, but was already highly organised. There was no such thing as episcopal independence. The two commanding sees of Antioch and Alexandria with their immense provinces of subordinate sees, as soon as they come into the full light of history, appear in a relationship of subordination to Rome (p. 121).

This closes the evidence of the third century. But before taking leave of this period, the author stops to consider a recent attempt to set aside the witness of the Popes themselves.

Exaggerated claims in favour of the papacy [says Mr. Fuller] when they occur in the writings of popes or of other persons living, so to speak, in a papal atmosphere, and when they stand in marked contrast with the general teaching of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, cannot be quoted, at any rate controversially, on the papal side. *We* regard them as the proofs of papal ambition. In connection with this subject, it is surely permissible to refer in all reverence to our Lord's own words: "If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true" (St. John v. 31).*

In his answer to this argument, Father Rivington is seen at his best. Having explained the meaning of the words cited from the Gospel, he adds :

Our Lord, therefore, rested His claim to their acceptance on two grounds, His own witness and that of the Baptist, the two together satisfying the formal requirements of their law. To His own it was enough that He "spake with authority" in a way that none had ever done, touching chords of their hearts which no power had been able thus to sweep with the hand of a master, proclaiming Himself the real author of their inmost being. St. Peter, when our Lord appealed to the twelve as to whether they would leave Him, replied at once, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." There was a richness, a fulness, in His teaching that met the imperious needs of their souls as no other teaching ever had. To them it was a felt truth that, as our Lord afterwards said, "Although I give testimony of myself, my testimony is true" (St. John viii. 14). Now the Church is the extension of the Incarnation, and as our Lord was in the world, so is she. The same

* "Primitive," SS., p. 97, n. 2.

feature that strikes us in the teaching of our Lord meets us in the teaching of His Church. She speaks with the tone of authority ; she bears witness of herself. And as there is no logical alternative between considering that either our Lord (may He forgive the words) uttered blasphemy when He bore the witness that He did to Himself, or that He was what He said He was, literally and fully Almighty God, so is it with His Church, and so is it with those who represent His Church from age to age (p. 128).

It may seem somewhat rash to add anything to the words we have quoted. But we are tempted to dwell on the fact that the Popes only witness for their office. Certainly the testimony they gave was not for their own interest or advantage, but laid on their own shoulders a double burden in days of great danger. On the objector's theory, the early Popes were surely the worst offenders for they must have opened the path of ambition. But these, as Father Rivington reminds us, were, with scarce an exception, saints and martyrs.

The objection, we might add, has obviously a wider application. These writers who make the Papacy the outcome of ambition, have happily a truer idea of the episcopal office, which they have learnt at the feet of the primitive saints. But does it never occur to our friends that these holy Fathers were Bishops themselves? Why is the witness of St. Ignatius or St. Cyprian to the sublime character of their own office less open to objection than that of the Popes? Must we put them out of court and take our ideas of the episcopate entirely from simple priests, like St. Jerome?

After showing that the testimony of the Popes is the unvarying voice of a long line of holy Bishops, which finds an echo in the Church they rule, Father Rivington has a word to say on the resistance occasionally offered to their power. There is no need to linger on this point, for taken at its worst the resistance is outweighed by the general submission. Only a few acts of the early Popes were opposed and, as it proved, opposed in vain. It was the view of St. Victor that triumphed in the end ; and the judgment of St. Stephen prevailed over that of St. Cyprian. And as the author tells us, the resistance offered is rather a proof of the authority than otherwise. Some critics show a disposition to treat this as a paradox. But surely there is such a thing as resistance that does imply a recognition of the authority opposed. If an imperial government interferes

in some subject colony and reverses the action of its local authorities, the latter may, rightly or wrongly, protest against this. They may urge that there was no ground for the intervention, that the original judgment was right, or that the central government had been misled. But if the interference came from a foreign state or from some sister colony, a similar protest would surely be inadequate. Then, the only answer would be an indignant denial of any right to intervene. To discuss the case on its merits would be a fatal admission. And if some resistance thus implies a recognition of the authority resisted, all authority implies possible resistance. The supremacy and infallibility of the Popes would not save them from occasional opposition even from good though mistaken men. And the fact of such opposition arising is, therefore, no argument against the Papal Primacy.

We have dwelt at some length on the first part of Father Rivington's book, and we must therefore touch more lightly and briefly on the two succeeding sections. There is less reason to regret this, as much that has been said of the first period will apply to the work as a whole. In the second period, A.D. 300-384, the author deals with the Donatists and the Council of Arles, and the two General Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople. Here, again, the Papal Primacy is plainly shown in the authoritative actions of the saintly Popes Sylvester, Julius, Liberius and Damasus; and in the witness of the great Greek Fathers, St. Athanasius and St. Basil. At the same time, such disputed points as the Sardican Canons, the Meletian Schism, and the Third Canon of Constantinople, are clearly and admirably treated. A chapter is also devoted to explaining the true meaning of Gratian's imperial rescript.

Under the third period, A.D. 400-452, we have a valuable account of the relations of the African Church with Rome; and an instructive history of the Council of Ephesus, which is already familiar to readers of this REVIEW.* The argument of the whole book culminates in the witness of St. Leo and the Council of Chalcedon to the Roman Primacy. Excellent throughout from first to last, Father Rivington's work is singularly happy in the opportunity of its ending. The

* See the April and July numbers for 1892.

centuries that follow bring further evidence for the Primacy, and they too have their dark places on which some light might be thrown by the same able hand. And, we may add, our gratitude so far partakes of the proverbial sense of favours to come that we look forward to seeing them treated in similar fashion. But the present work is whole in itself, *teres atque rotundus*. Where, indeed, could it finish more fitly than with the story of the Council where Peter spoke by the mouth of Leo? The evidence afforded by the Council of Chalcedon is more generally known than that of the earlier period. But many are far from appreciating its full force; and the subject, moreover, is not without its difficulties. Hence, as Father Rivington says, there was need of a more complete treatment of its history than anything extant in English. His own careful account of that history, besides its intrinsic worth, has the advantage of coming as a timely answer to some recent Anglican objections.

In addition to its more solid merits, Father Rivington's book is eminently readable. The serious train of reasoning is relieved by the interest of the narrative, and brightened by the graphic pictures of some of the early councils of the Church. Quotations and references to the ancient writers are naturally numerous, but the book is not overloaded. Great care has been taken to ensure accuracy, and works of doubtful authenticity are studiously avoided. Only once do we miss the author's wonted caution. This is when he cites the *De Sacramentis* as evidence for the opinion of St. Ambrose. That work is doubtless a valuable monument of antiquity, not far removed from the age of the saint whose name it bears. But there are reasons for assigning it to another hand. Elsewhere, we are told that St. Victor "was the first, according to Eusebius, to excommunicate the forerunner of Arius—viz., Theodotus, 'the leader and father of this God-denying apostasy, the first one that asserted that Christ was a mere man'" (p. 133). But the words from Eusebius (v. 28) are in a quotation from Hippolytus, and the "God-denying apostasy" is the heresy of Artemon. These slips, however, are merely minor matters, and may be cited as the proverbial exception that proves the rule.

The force of Father Rivington's reasoning is felt all the more, because he never strains an argument or presses it too

far. If in some instances he inclines to hold a view that is open to question—*e.g.*, on the Sardican Canons, he is careful to make his argument independent of it.

A pleasing feature in the book is the author's unfailing courtesy to his opponents. He speaks of them as "our Anglican friends," and one feels that with him this is no mere fashion of speech. There is happily no trace of those hasty charges of dishonesty and that needless asperity of tone that stain so many controversial writings, both Anglican and Catholic. The work is pleasing in style and forcible in its reasoning; but there is a far higher charm in the spirit of charity and living faith that animates the whole. Looking at the learned labour of which its pages bear so many tokens, we might say that the author shows a mastery of his subject. But it would be nearer the mark to say that the truth he teaches has mastered him. We feel as we read him, that here is no disputant aiming at a dialectic victory, no pleader making out a case. It is simply one who is full of the truth he has found, and seeks to impart to others the light that has opened on his own sight. For this reason he fitly finishes, not in a strain of triumph or a burst of rhetoric, but with the echo of simple earnest words from Père Gratry's dying lips, and with the old Oxford motto that wakens memories of the past and hope for the future.

"It is with the prayer that some may perceive the error of opposing the dogma of Papal Supremacy and follow the example of this 'noble and truth-loving priest,' as Canon Bright calls him, that this work has been written. *Dominus illuminatio mea*" (p. [460]).

W. H. KENT, O.S.C.,

ART. IX.—MARLBOROUGH.

The Life of John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, to the Accession of Queen Anne. By GENERAL VISCOUNT WOLSELEY, K.P.
London: Richard Bentley and Son. 1894.

THE most successful general of the reign of Queen Victoria enters the literary arena as the author of a life of the successful general whose victories shed a lustre upon the reign of Queen Anne. The two volumes which Lord Wolseley, in the scanty leisure of his busy career, has found time to write bring down the story of Marlborough to the date of the death of William III. Thus the most important part of Marlborough's life as Captain-General has not been touched, but these two volumes excite hopes that the work will soon be completed, for it is as a military historian that Lord Wolseley excels. In dealing with the early campaigns in which Churchill served in subordinate positions the author has given a most lucid narrative of the warlike operations with valuable comments upon and criticisms of the strategy displayed, which will make this work a text-book henceforth in every military library. Even to the general reader Lord Wolseley's pages in which he treats these professional topics are full of interest. For instance, it is with quite dramatic skill that Lord Wolseley tells once more the story of the battle of Sedgmoor, shows how Feversham's negligence in the Royal camp invited a surprise, how nearly the night attack by Monmouth was successful, despite the gallantry of Churchill, and that if the peasant guide had only thought of mentioning to Monmouth the existence of the wet ditch across the moor, the whole course of English history would have been changed and a Scottish Duke of Buccleugh, instead of the German House of Hanover, would now reign over Britain.

But the military portion of the work, although excellent, is not the portion to which a Catholic reader turns. The social life of the great Duke and of his contemporaries is sketched with much skill and research, and the author gives much space to the politics of that troublous time. Indeed the task which

Lord Wolseley has set himself is to cleanse the reputation of Marlborough from the aspersions which many generations of writers have cast upon his fair fame. It is at least a courageous attempt on the part of Lord Wolseley, and by its audacity it may extort our admiration, even if it does not convince our judgment.

John Churchill was born in 1650, the year after the death of Charles I. His father was a Cavalier, who had fallen into poverty because of his adherence to the Royalist cause and had chosen as his motto the words *Faithful though unfortunate*, which, in their Spanish form *Fiel pero desdichado*, are still the motto of the Ducal House of Marlborough. Few men live up to their mottoes, but, surely, if some soothsayer had shown to Winston Churchill the crooked career of his eldest son John, the hapless Cavalier would not have selected those words for his motto. Axminster in Devonshire was the birthplace of John Churchill and of the other children of the impoverished Cavalier in those dark days. A country seat near Axminster called Ash House had been ruined in the civil war, but sufficient was standing to afford an asylum and shelter. Portion of Ash House is now a farmhouse. Lord Wolseley describes the spot and laments that the old private chapel in which John Churchill was baptized is now degraded as a storeroom for apples and a cider press. In the orchards and lanes about Axminster John Churchill spent the ten years of his childhood, and it must have been an advantage to Brigadier-General Churchill, when harassing Monmouth's rear in 1685, or escaping by night to the camp of the Prince of Orange in 1688, that he was upon ground familiar to him from infancy.

At the Restoration in 1660 the fortunes of the Churchill family improved. The father obtained knighthood and an office which brought in an income and so gave the family bread to eat. The eldest daughter Arabella in 1664 became maid in the household of the Duchess of York, and John was sent to St. Paul's School in the City of London. That school was closed in 1665, because of the Plague, and Sir Winston Churchill then obtained a post for his son John as one of the pages of the Duke of York. Two years later, in 1667, young Churchill was appointed ensign in the Guards, and it is an ominous prelude to his whole career that the

vacancy to which John Churchill was gazetted had been caused by the dismissal as a Papist of John Howard, during the popular outcry that the Catholics had caused the Great Fire of 1666. By this time Arabella Churchill had become the mistress of the Duke of York and was bearing him children, of whom the best known is the Duke of Berwick, the victor of Almanza. No amount of partiality on the part of any biographer can do away with these plain facts that Sir Winston Churchill permitted his daughter to remain in the household of the Duke of York as his mistress and permitted his son to accept advancement at the Duke's hands. However, the lad was not a mere holiday soldier. He was at Tangiers in his nineteenth year and saw service there. It is to be wished that Lord Wolseley had told us more of his views about Tangiers, for the topic has much interest. It came to the English crown with Bombay as part of the dowry of Catherine of Braganza in 1661, and for some years was held by an English garrison. Bombay remains and calls itself *Urbs Prima in Indis*. Tangiers was relinquished, and the only trace left of the English occupation is that the British soldier even to the present day scorns to distinguish amidst the various Asiatic races and calls them all Moors, whether Hindu or Mussulman. Perhaps if Tangiers had also been handed over to that company of merchants trading from Leadenhall Street it might now rival Bombay.

When Churchill returned to London from Tangiers his name came into notoriety and was even mentioned in the gossiping despatches of the French Ambassador as the lover of the Duchess of Cleveland, one of the mistresses of Charles II. Because of this he fell into disfavour with the King, and had to absent himself from court, but the Duchess recompensed him with a gift of £4500, and with this sum the prudent youth purchased an annuity.

In 1672 the French and English kings agreed to declare war together against Holland. The pretext set forth by Charles II. was the Dutch refusal to dip their flags to every English man-of-war in the narrow seas, and it is curious to note that the narrow seas covered by this claim were not only the Straits of Dover but the sea from Cape Finisterre to the Norwegian coast. Churchill fought on board ship at the naval battle of Southwold and was promoted to be captain. Crossing over to

Holland in 1673 he greatly distinguished himself by his bravery at the siege of Maestricht and was raised to the rank of lieutenant-colonel. In the following year, 1674, he was made colonel of the Royal English Regiment in the service of the French king, and saw three campaigns under Marshal Turenne. In 1677 he became colonel in the English army and married Sarah Jennings, a maid of honour, the well-known Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough. One of the most noticeable features in Churchill's character as drawn by Lord Wolseley is his attachment to his termagant wife. Many of his letters are given in full, and they breathe a tender love even twenty-five years after their marriage. There was constant occasion to write these letters, for Churchill was often absent from his wife's side when in attendance on the Duke of York at Brussels, Edinburgh, and elsewhere. It is curious to note that the Duke of York took thirty-eight days to march from London to Edinburgh, and that Churchill writes to his wife to send waxlights from London as there were none to be had in Edinburgh. In 1685, when the Duke of York came to the throne, Churchill got a colonelcy of Life Guards, and was raised to the peerage.

When the Royal troops took the field in the western counties to repel Monmouth's invasion, Lord Churchill served under Lord Feversham with the rank of Brigadier-General. He did good work in following up with his horse the rear of Monmouth's advancing column, and when Monmouth's night attack was delivered on the Royal army at Sedgmoor, it was Churchill who got the King's troops into some sort of order to resist the onslaught. But he was one of the noblemen who entered into correspondence with the Prince of Orange and invited his armed intervention, even before the birth of the Prince of Wales had made the Princess of Orange only heiress presumptive of King James II. In the Royal camp at Salisbury Churchill was Brigadier with a command of 5000 men. Lord Wolseley says plainly that if Churchill had been loyal the invasion of the Prince of Orange must have failed. However, he deserted and went over to the enemy's camp, and in the subsequent political manœuvres he supported the Prince of Orange in his successful efforts to obtain the British crown. It is not to be wondered at that William III. distrusted the

man. Lord Wolseley says that the cause of William's dislike was the attachment of Lord and Lady Churchill to the Princess Anne, but, whatever may have been the cause, William rewarded Churchill with the empty title of Earl of Marlborough, and selected Dutch generals to command his armies. When matters were not going well in Ireland under these Dutch generals, Marlborough saw his opportunity, and persuaded Queen Mary's Council to permit him to undertake an expedition against Cork and Kinsale, which were still held for King James. In this expedition he was completely successful, and the description of the taking of Cork is one of the ablest portions of Lord Wolseley's book. Although he thus accepted office under William III., Marlborough carried on a correspondence with James II. and supplied him with information of William's plans. The worst instance was his giving information of the contemplated attack on Brest in which Tollemache lost his life. Whether William suspected this treason or whether because of the quarrels between the court and Princess Anne, Marlborough was dismissed from office, and for a few days, when a French invasion was imminent, he was even imprisoned in the Tower. After the death of Queen Mary he was restored to William's council; but these volumes end at the accession of Queen Anne, and do not enter upon Marlborough's career as Generalissimo.

Such was John Churchill in youth and in middle age, and it must be admitted that there is ample scope for an apologetic biographer. It is impossible to deny the blots in his escutcheon, but Lord Wolseley strives to palliate them, and adopts the tone of an advocate addressing the Court in mitigation of punishment. After the Restoration honesty and chastity were rare at Whitehall. John Churchill was at an age when most boys are at school. When a man has done good service to the State, why need we pry into his youthful amours? Public opinion in those days did not condemn the relatives of a Prince's mistress who rose by her influence. So says Lord Wolseley. It is an unsavoury subject, and as the father, Sir Winston Churchill, did not object, perhaps we must not expect too high a standard from the son, but we would fain hope that the Churchill family was not a fair sample of the Cavalier families after the Restoration. Even in the Anglican Church of that

day there must have been seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to the Baal of vice. When Brigadier-General Churchill, in 1685, served in Somersetshire in the campaign against Monmouth, the pious Ken was Bishop of Bath and Wells. Novelists strive to be realistic, but Thackeray in "The Esmonds," depicted men who turned with horror from infamy such as that of John Churchill. As a soldier himself, Lord Wolseley must have found it hard to write as he has done of Churchill's desertion in 1688 to the enemy against whom he was serving in the field. The line of defence taken is that Churchill's attachment to the Protestant religion was so strong that he felt compelled by his conscience to break his faith as a soldier and to forfeit all the advantages he hoped to receive from King James's favour. The first answer that suggests itself to this contention is that Churchill, in 1685, fought against Monmouth, who posed as the Protestant champion. But, says Lord Wolseley, Churchill was shocked at Judge Jeffreys's cruel assize in the West, and was convinced by James's arbitrary proceedings against the universities and bishops that the King would sooner or later impose the Catholic religion on England by force. In expounding this argument Lord Wolseley has written some curious sentences. He says that Judge Jeffreys was sent against the "peaceable" peasants of the west, although many previous pages had been given to the description of how the whole country-side was ready to join Monmouth in armed rebellion, and how these "peaceable" peasants had almost defeated the royal army at Sedgmoor. We surmise that Brigadier-General Churchill was not impelled to quit King James's service because of Jeffreys's assize more than was Captain Garnet Wolseley impelled to quit Queen Victoria's service because of the number of persons hanged in Bengal with very little trial in 1857. Then in several passages Lord Wolseley writes as if the Church of Rome taught the duty of entire obedience to kings. This is an entire mistake. The Church of Rome teaches that subjects may and ought to resist their rulers in certain circumstances. It was the Anglican Church in the seventeenth century that taught the doctrine of passive obedience. Lord Wolseley writes with such warmth on this topic that he calls James "a King who impiously claimed to rule by Divine right and the grace of God." The words "by

the grace of God " are still used in every proclamation and on every coin, but there is nothing impious in them. It is probable that Lord Wolseley has indicated the source of Churchill's scruples, where he says that King James preferred to have Catholic officers about him. If Churchill saw a prospect of being superseded by Catholic officers that would bring about the change in his loyalty. Even if Lord Wolseley's major premiss be granted and it be conceded that Churchill was actuated by patriotic motives and by fear for the Protestant religion, the minor premiss may still be debated that this did not justify his treachery. It was open to him to resign his post and to cross over to Holland where he could have offered an untarnished sword to the Prince of Orange. Desertion in the field to the enemy is the most grave of military offences, and it is difficult to imagine any circumstances that would justify it. A soldier does not concern himself about the reasons for or the results of a war. That responsibility rests on others. His business is to fight. It is possible that some officers under Lord Wolseley's command in Egypt in 1882 thought the British intervention a mistake, but they fought at Tel-el-Kebir. There is a passage in this book that sets this forth clearly. Writing of Lord Sandwich at the naval battle of Southwold in 1672, Lord Wolseley says :

He seems to have made up his mind to die in the first action, and by the gallant manner of his death to show how cruelly and unjustly he had been suspected. He detested the war with Holland, for he knew it to be an unholy war prosecuted for un-English objects by King Charles and the infamous crew who were his Ministers.

Another point that tells strongly against Lord Wolseley's theory is that two years afterwards Marlborough entered into correspondence with the exiled James II. If his fear of Romanism was so acute, why did he thus intrigue to get back the Catholic King? Lord Wolseley's explanation is that Marlborough did not really wish to see James again at Whitehall, but a restoration was always possible, and Marlborough wished to secure his own head from the block. To make his overtures appear to be true Marlborough sent information, but he took good care to send only such information as had already been sent by somebody else. Lord Wolseley so convinces himself that on page 388 he speaks of Marlborough's conduct

as "upright." It is a matter of opinion ; but "upright" does not seem to be a well-chosen epithet. The explanation may be true, but a more probable explanation is that which Lord Wolseley himself, in an unguarded moment, gives, when he says that William III., by appointing Dutch generals and not sufficiently rewarding Marlborough, drove him into this correspondence with James. By saying this Lord Wolseley practically throws up his brief.

But that is only one of several instances in which Lord Wolseley seems to have forgotten what he had written elsewhere. Probably the cause is given in the preface, where Lord Wolseley says that the book was written at long intervals. There are some passages very offensive to Catholic ears. The Duke of York, after his conversion, practised the Catholic religion, but that fact seems never to be mentioned without a sneer—"priestcraft," "pet priests," "obedient to his confessor." In speaking, at page 216, of Titus Oates's Plot, Lord Wolseley says : "There can be no doubt that there had been a serious conspiracy for the complete extirpation of Protestantism in England." In speaking of the warming-pan fable, Lord Wolseley says that doubtless there were persons about the King who would not have scrupled to introduce a supposititious Prince of Wales. But in compensation for these insults comes the following fine passage :

In Ireland William III. has always been looked upon as a king of strong anti-Roman Catholic tendencies ; but this is an incorrect view of his character. Before the English victory at Aughrim he had with true wisdom and liberality wished to offer to the Irish Catholics the free exercise of their religion together with half the church buildings and half their ancient church property. Had this been the practical result of his Irish conquest, of what difficulties it would have relieved the United Kingdom, and what an amount of misery it would have saved the warm-hearted, clever, but easily misled Irish people.

So in several passages Lord Wolseley takes too low a standard of the motives which should animate a soldier, writing as if desire of personal distinction were the most potent excitant, but he makes up for these passages by a fine discourse on page 445 of volume ii. upon "duty" as the watchword of great men. It is possible that the author's own opinions may have changed as he wrote the various portions of the book.

Lord Wolseley tells us that Marlborough put the crown on the head of William III. In other words, King James lost his crown because Churchill abandoned him. Britain lost her Catholic dynasty through Churchill's treacherous desertion. Perhaps in the end Marlborough's crime may have benefited the Catholic Church in these islands. If the Catholic Stuarts had retained the throne, it is possible that the story of France might have been repeated in England, and that, after the power of parliament had dwindled away, the mob might have swept away the throne and every outward symbol of the Christian religion with it. Or, worse, the Catholic Church in England under royal patronage might have been imbued with Gallican principles. Perhaps it is all for the best that after more than a century of penal laws the Catholic Church which James II. upheld in England blossomed into its "second spring" without any aid from a palace.

G. T. MACKENZIE.

ART. X.—SOME FEATURES OF PAPAL JURISDICTION IN MEDIEVAL ENGLAND.

Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland. Papal Letters I., 1198–1304. Edited by W. H. BLISS, B.C.L. Published under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. 4to. Pp. 778. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.

IT is a commonplace of English history that the Popes exercised jurisdiction over the Church in this country before the Reformation. But only those who are familiar with the records of the period are likely to be aware how closely and how constantly Papal jurisdiction was invoked, and how intimately its exercise was interwoven with the whole fabric of national and social life in England. To measure the extent and impact of Papal authority, and to gauge the relations of Rome and England in pre-Reformation times, we could suggest to the impartial inquirer no simpler or safer method than to turn over for himself the pages of the Papal Registers which have just been edited by Mr. Bliss, and published under the direction of the Master of the Rolls.

When Leo XIII., in the fulfilment of that enlightened policy which so luminously marks his whole pontificate, threw open the treasures of the Vatican library to the students of Europe, the various nations hastened to avail themselves of the opportunity, and sent thither competent scholars to cull from the Vatican archives the materials which concerned the history of their respective countries. The British Government commissioned Mr. Bliss for this purpose, and the present work represents the first instalment of his labours. The correspondence which passed between England and the Holy See found its way, in large measure, into the Papal Registers, or collections of letters known as *Regesta*. These Mr. Bliss has duly examined, and in a volume uniform in size and shape with the usual Calendars of State Papers issued from the Rolls Office, he has given a list of the Papal documents relating to these countries between the years 1198 and 1304, with a short summary sufficient to

indicate the purport of each. The collection so far contains an account of some 5000 documents. This number gives an average of about forty-seven per year, or nearly one a week, passing between England and the Holy See for the 106 years included in the present volume.

The Calendar State-paper method which presents to the reader not the *ipsissima verba* of a document but an intelligent summary of its contents, has the double advantage, first of sparing the reader the tiresome recurrence of stereotyped forms, and of thus putting him at once in possession of the facts, giving a *coup d'œil* of the position unattainable perhaps by any other way; and secondly by enabling the editor to compress within the compass of one or more volumes materials which given in their entirety would probably occupy fifty or a hundred. On the other hand, the method labours under the drawback that certain graphic details of personal or local interest—often the *obiter dicta* of the writer—so valuable in these days when history, like art, aims at representing not merely fact but life—may easily escape through the sieve of the summarist. A still graver disadvantage, we take it, lies in the fact that the true and historic relations of powers can hardly be accurately apprehended if we leave out of count the tone or feeling which animates their correspondence. But much of this living tone, whether friendly or hostile, is likely to evaporate in the process of summarising, and naturally but little of it can be expected to be left in the colourless *précis* of a calendar. We note this fact, not to discount the inestimable value of this and other State-paper collections, but rather in the hope that readers of Mr. Bliss's admirable volume may be tempted to go further and examine such portions of these or analogous documents as may be within their reach, whether in Wilkins, Rymer, Theiner, Jaffé, or Potthast, Marini or elsewhere, so that in their light they may gauge for themselves what Rome was to England, and what England was to Rome in the centuries which preceded the Reformation. We do not imply for a moment that the reader will not carry away from the perusal of the work of Mr. Bliss a deep and correct and valuable impression of the intimate and varied relations between the Popes and the English crown, Church and nation—he undoubtedly will as far as State-paper knowledge can convey

it—but we would suggest that the skeleton impression thus gained will be all the better for being clothed with the flesh and blood and life that find their source in the original document.

The incidence of these documents bear broadly upon the entire surface of the national structure. Some affect the kings, others the baronage, others the primates, others the bishops and their dioceses, others the monasteries and the cathedral chapters, others the clergy and the parochial churches, while others concerned the domestic affairs of families. No phase of English life seems to have lain outside their influence.

THE POPE AND THE KINGS.

The period comprised in this volume covers the era of the Magna Charta, and therefore includes what might be called the perigee in the temporal relations between the English crown and the Holy See. The English king became a vassal of the Pope. It is unnecessary to observe that the relation of vassalage imports to the general reader in the nineteenth century an opprobrium which would have been utterly absent from the minds of even the noblest princes or barons of the thirteenth. In our own time, nations strengthen one another by concluding alliances offensive and defensive. In the Middle Ages, they did the same, but the smaller nations had a way of sheltering themselves under the cover of the stronger ones. The alliance took the form of "Commendation," as Mr. Freeman very well describes it. The weaker power commended itself to the stronger. The stronger ruler took the weaker one under his protection, and the weaker in return offered "fealty" or "homage" and became the "man" of the stronger. As the Papacy was then amongst the strongest of European Powers, several States found it convenient to enter into this commendatory alliance with it, and to claim its protection by offers of temporal homage. The Norman kingdom of Naples and other nations had done so, and King John in the hour of his need deemed it well to follow their example. Commendation was, of course, an agreement upon a footing, not of co-ordination but of honourable subordination; but it is probable that the king and his barons saw in such a course not much more of humiliation or dishonour than King

Humbert or Signor Crispi in our own day see in the Triple Alliance. The event finds its record in the Calendar in the following three entries :

1212. 13 *May*, Letters patent of the king submitting to the Pope (opp. *Dover*. ed. Migne iii. 876, *Fœdera*).
 15 *May*. Letters patent of the king resigning his kingdom to the Pope (opp. ed. Migne iii. 878, Stubbs' *Select charters*, *Fœdera*).
 15 *May*, *apud Templum de Well*. Letters of the king to the Pope, offering a yearly payment of 1000 marks (opp. ed. Migne iii. 881).
 1213. 2 *Non July, Lateran*. Letter to the king thanking him for the satisfaction and submission he has made by granting his kingdom to the Roman Church, from which he holds it at the yearly cess of 700 marks for England and 300 for Ireland (opp. ed. Migne iii. 881).

The following is the record of the like submission made by the king of the Isle of Man.

1219. 10 *Kal. Oct. Temple, London*. Letter from Reginald, King of the Isles, to the Pope. At the exhortation of Pandulph, Papal legate, he has given to the Pope his island of Man, and he binds himself and his heirs to hold it in fee from the Roman Church, and to pay homage and fealty for it, paying yearly 12 marks in England at the Abbey of Furnis, at the feast of the Purification. This gift the legate received on the part of the Pope, and gave the island in fee to the King and his heirs, to be held in the name of the Roman Church. The King of the Isles therefore informs the Pope that at the mandate of the legate he has sworn to observe the aforesaid, and to give security for himself, his heirs, and the men of the island; in testimony whereof he has caused these letters patent to be made. Witnesses, C. Bishop of Bangor. Master M. Official of the Isle of Man. John, Clerk. Ivo son (of) Hollwed, Master Ivo. Holanus, Steward of the King of Man. He prays the Pope to send him that privilege which is granted to other Kings, tributaries, and vassals of the Roman Church.

The letters to the English kings are much in the same strain, and move within the same round of interests with which readers of Theiner's *Monumenta*, or Rymer's *Fœdera*, or the Papal Bulls in the Record Office, or the Abbate Marino Marini's transcripts are sufficiently familiar.

Pope Gregory X., in 1273, writes to King Edward I. to notify the assembly of the General Council, and summons the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, Dublin, Cashel, Tuam and Armagh, and their suffragans to be present thereat. He writes to the Queen Eleanor to exhort her to use her influence for peace and goodwill amongst members of the royal family. In the same year the king has written to inform the Pope that there was a standing feud between his father and the Hastings family. Now there is a chance of making peace between the two houses, for John, son of Henry de Hastings wishes to marry Isabella, the late king's niece. But they are second cousins, once removed. Will the Pope grant a dispensation from the ecclesiastical impediment of consanguinity? The Pope commands the Archbishop of Canterbury to grant the dispensation requested, "if the said marriage be conducive to peace in England." The queen has an Italian cleric who acts as her physician. Apparently she would like to have him maintained out of the funds of the Church. She wishes the Pope to let him have a benefice in the diocese of Canterbury. The Pope, who no doubt was good enough to consider the good queen's health in the light of a Church interest, graciously orders the archbishop to provide him with one. Pope Martin IV. writes to Edward I. in reply to eight petitions which the king had laid before him concerning the raising of a tenth for crusade purposes. There was generally no difficulty about granting a tenth for a crusade, provided the king would really use it for that purpose—a point which the Pope does not seem to be ready to take for granted. But the king wished to go further, and asked to be allowed to take the first-fruits of void benefices for ten years. To this the Pope emphatically says no, and adds that to no prince, even in aid of the Holy Land, has such a concession ever been granted.

One cannot help thinking that the modern efforts of the Peace Society had an all-powerful precedent in the policy of the Popes in the Middle Ages.* The same Pope sends to the

* When Lewelin in A.D. 1234 was raiding many of the English counties and causing widespread disorder, King Henry III. complained to Pope Gregory IX. of the apathy of the English bishops, who looked upon the outrages as trifling, and failed to use the censures of the Church against the

king an urgent injunction to keep the peace—identical letters having been sent to the Kings of France, Sicily, Portugal, and to the leaders of the great military orders. The queen having settled her physician, wants a benefice for her chancellor. Rome says yes, and the chancellor gets it. Honorius IV. forwards to the king minute instructions as to the collection of the tenth for the Holy Land. He confirms the king's foundation and endowment of a monastery in the diocese of St. Asaph. He then issues an injunction to King Alexander III. of Scotland to look more carefully to the protection of the churches and clergy—the Bishops of Ross and Moray have been complaining to the Pope about the excesses of the king's officials. The Pope confirms a grant of 1300 marks to be made as a dower to the widow of the son of the Scottish king. In 1291 Pope Nicholas IV. grants an indult to Edmund, son of King Henry, allowing him to choose his confessor, who may give him absolution in all cases not reserved to the Holy See. The same is granted to Blanche, Edmund's wife. Moreover, Edmund is granted the privilege of a portable altar. Further, Edmund and Blanche are allowed to have the divine offices celebrated privately in places under sentence of interdict. (It is perhaps well to know that, for if by any chance in the records of this country some evidence had been suddenly unearthed to the effect that this royal couple had acted on this indult, there are writers of English history who would have seized upon the fact to impress upon their readers that the prince had defied the apostolic censures, and set at nought the authority of the Holy See!) In 1298, Boniface VIII. writes to Edward I. to say that he has accepted the post of arbiter between him and the King of France. He grants to the same king the indult that the clerks and laymen of his household may go to confession to the king's chaplain. Queen Margaret is to have the privilege of a portable altar.

Writers insufficiently acquainted with the methods of the Middle Ages are wont to denounce in unqualified terms the practice of pluralism and the giving of benefices to youthful

perpetrators, and excused themselves, saying that "Lewelin was no parishioner of theirs." The Pope, to maintain the cause of public order in England, sent forthwith a mandate to the Bishops of Durham and Rochester to use, if need be, the Papal authority to compel the Archbishop of Canterbury and his suffragans to do their duty in preserving the peace of the realm.

clerics not yet ordained, or to non-resident clergy. And undoubtedly English Primates like Peckham have joined in the condemnation. But it may be doubted if the writers to whom we allude at all times sufficiently take into account the fact that often it was precisely by holding two or more benefices, and putting in a vicar to do the parochial work, that clerics were able to maintain themselves and pursue their studies at the English or Continental Universities; and that it was by the same expedient that non-resident clerks were enabled to support themselves while they devoted themselves to one or other branch of the royal or national service. Thus in some measure pluralism furnished practically the means of a system of educational and official endowment, and did to some extent what scholarships and the Civil Service fund do at the present day.

Thus Pope Nicholas IV. grants to Edward I. an indult that ten clerks engaged in his service may receive the fruits of their benefices for eight years—daily distributions excepted—the said clerks being non-resident therein. In another instance, the queen's chaplains are provided for in the same manner. Alexander IV., in 1255, grants an indult to Roger Luvel, of Witheton, one of the king's clerks and papal chaplain, to receive his income and be non-resident from his benefices, "while studying at Paris, Oxford or elsewhere." The king asks that another of his clerks, Philip Luvel, who acts as his chaplain and treasurer, may have an additional benefice, and the Pope writes to concede the favour. Besides these, we have many grants to the English clergy to add one or more to the number of their benefices.

We take it that the dispensations for plurality had three recognised justifications—poverty of a single benefice, the clerical education of the future incumbent, and the endowment of certain official positions of general ecclesiastical or national utility.

That this method of endowment based on pluralism had in some measure the conscientious sanction of public opinion is borne out by the fact that many of the most illustrious and saintly of the fourteenth and fifteenth century prelates, such as Wykeham of Winchester, Smith of Lincoln, and Oldham of Exeter, were noted pluralists before their elevation to the

episcopate. We can quite conceive that pluralism was attended by evils and abuses, but in forming our historical estimate of these it is important to discount the element of recognised utility to which we have referred.

Finally, to these various phases of Papal and Royal correspondence, we have to add the numerous letters in which the Pope notifies to the king that he has appointed an English bishop or an abbot, and reminds him that although the Papal-Royal correspondence covers a wide area and enters into a manifold variety of interests, the tone which pervades it, even at times when there was much to try the patience of the parties on both sides, is consistently cordial and respectful. The Pope invariably salutes the English Sovereign as his "beloved" or "most dear son in Christ, the illustrious King of England," and almost always concludes by a blessing. The king, on his part, salutes the Pope as "most Holy Father and Lord in Christ" and "Sovereign Pontiff," and offers him "due subjection and all manner of service,"* or "due reverence to so great a Father,"† and "devoutly kisses the blessed feet,"‡ and concludes with a prayer that the Pope may be "long spared for the government of God's Holy Church." The body of the communications which lies between these recognised beginnings and endings is exactly what we should expect of a Catholic sovereign or the supreme head of the Church, and would compare favourably in excellence of tone and temper and good feeling with the correspondence which passes between the Court of Rome and the governments, say, of Spain or Austria, at the present day.

THE PAPACY AND THE ARCHBISHOPS.

The archbishops, as metropolitans and as *legati nati*, were normally the chief agents in England of the Pope, whom, as Grossetete and Archbishop Walter Reynolds so emphatically declared, they could not lawfully disobey.§ As Archbishop

* Edward the Confessor to Pope Nicholas, Wilkins, i. 319.

† Henry III. to Pope Gregory IX., Wilkins, i. 568.

‡ Edward I. to Clement V., Wilkins, ii. 282.

§ "Having gravely considered these things, we have resolved rather to suffer the temporal dangers and risks of the present, by fulfilling the Apostolic commands than by disobeying them, to offend the divine Majesty."—Letter of Archbishop Reynolds to his suffragans in 1320.

Warham said in a later age, they were "executors or commissaries of the commands of the Pope," "and to disobey him would be perjury rather than which death itself would be preferable."* The archbishops were thus the depositories of the Apostolic commands, and in matters which concerned the church of the province, the distributors of the Papal ordinances intended for their suffragans. Thus, when the Pope issued an ordinance to the Southern province, he addressed it to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The archbishop thereupon drew up a "communicatory letter" for his suffragans, in which he embodied the Papal letter, and then promulgates it, declaring that in so doing he executes the Papal commands "as we are bound to do." A fair specimen of these promulgations is the letter of Archbishop Winchelsey in 1296. He incorporates a letter from the Papal Legates, incorporating in turn an ordinance of Pope Boniface VIII., and appends to it this injunction :

Wherefore wishful, as it behoveth us, to execute in this matter what is commanded, we command and enjoin you, according to the tenor of the aforesaid, that you in your diocese publicly and diligently execute, or cause to be executed, at the earliest possible opportunity, the said command, both as to publication and to all things else therein contained, according to the form before given, to us delivered, and according to the requirement of the law; and that, in so far as it concerns you, you shall observe the same, and shall cause it to be inviolably observed by your subjects.†

The archbishops wore the Roman Pallium, and were sworn to fealty and obedience to the Pope. As their suffragans in turn professed obedience to them, the Archiepiscopal or Pallium oath was naturally held to be a sufficiently binding tie between the entire bishops of the province and the Holy See, long before the practice obtained of exacting the oath of

* See Warham's Defence, published in this REVIEW, April 1894, p. 406. "And in so doing, I was but the Pope's commissarie. And the consecrating of the said busshop is principally the Pope's dede which commanded it to be doon. Wherfor I think it not reasonable that I shuld fall into a premunire for the doing of that thing; whereby (if I had done the contrary) I shuld have fallen into perjury." "And wher in this case not dooing the Pope's commandment, I shuld fall into perjury, and doing his commandment I shuld fall into a *premunire*, as is supposed, if a man could not chose but to fall into one of the said dayngers of perjury or *premunire*, *melius est incidere in manus hominum quam derelinquere legem Dei*."

† Wilkins, i. 323.

obedience from each bishop individually on the day of his consecration, although this latter method prevailed for a considerable time before the Reformation.

Thus, in the Papal Registers, we find in 1234 the following record of the despatch of the pallium to St. Edmund. (The Pope had previously quashed the election of John Blund, who had been elected, and who had received the royal assent.)

3 *Non. Feb. Lateran.* Letter to Edmund, archbishop elect of Canterbury, stating that the Pope has sent the pallium taken from the body of St. Peter, by Simon Leyrcestria, monk of Canterbury, Masters Henry Tessine, Canon of Salisbury, and Nicholas de Bureford to the Bishops of London and Rochester, who will give it to him.

Ibid. Mandate to the Bishops of London and Rochester to assign the pallium to the said archbishop elect, and receive his oath of fealty.

In 1239 the Bishops of Emly and Ardfert in Ireland are commissioned to deliver the pallium to the Archbishop of Cashel, who had petitioned for it. The commissioners are charged to receive his oath of fealty to the Pope, and "to return the said oath to the Pope, under letters patent sealed with his seal."* In the mandate to the Bishops of Clonfert, Killala and Aghadoe in 1289, commissioning them to give the pallium to William, Archbishop of Tuam, they are charged to "receive the oath of fealty according to the form sent with this mandate, to which is also appended the form of giving the pallium."

It is noteworthy that the taking of the oath of fealty was connected, not merely with the reception of the pallium, but with the ceremony of consecration. In this very case, and a fortnight previous to the issue of the above mandate, the Bishops of Clonfert and Killala and two other suffragans were ordered "to consecrate William, Archbishop-elect of Tuam, late rector of Athenry, in the diocese of Tuam, and to receive his oath of fealty to the Pope and to the Roman Church." In 1290, Stephen, Archdeacon of Glendalough, was consecrated by the Pope, and the pallium was given him by

* In 1279, three English bishops, London, Norwich and Worcester, are the pallium commissioners to receive the oath of fealty of John de Derlinton, Archbishop of Dublin. The Bishops of Leighlin and Farns acted in the same capacity to his successor, John de Saundford in 1285.

three Cardinals. The Bishops of Durham and Ely deliver the pallium and receive the oath of Papal obedience in 1298 from Henry de Newark, Archbishop of York.

In 1274, the Pope commands the Bishops of Moray, Aberdeen, and Argyle in Scotland, to examine into the fitness of Archibald, Archdeacon of Moray, and Bishop-elect of Caithness. A Cardinalitial Commission has examined and reported that his election was canonically carried out, but there is not sufficient evidence as to the worthiness of the candidate. The three bishops are to inquire into the matter, and if they find that he is a fit person, they are "to consecrate him, receiving his oath of fealty to the Pope." In the year following (1275) there is a precisely similar mandate to the Bishops of St. Andrews and Aberdeen, to examine Robert de Syvin for the See of Ross, and, if fit, "to consecrate him, receiving his oath of fealty to the Pope." This is followed by another to the Bishops of St. Andrews and Dunkeld, to examine into an election of William Comyn, a Dominican professor of theology at Perth, to the See of Brechin, and if satisfied as to its validity, and the fitness of the said William, "to consecrate him the bishop-elect, receiving his oath of fealty to the Pope."

THE OATH OF OBEDIENCE.

From a study of these and other data we may safely draw the following outline of the Church practice concerning the Oath of Obedience made by the hierarchies of these countries to the Apostolic See:—

1. The regulations as to taking an oath of obedience to the Pope, which we find set forth so fully in the Bulls by which Wolsey was appointed to the See of Lincoln (Rymer's "*Fœdera*," xiii. 390), and Ruthall to the See of Durham (*ib.* 28), in 1509 and 1503 respectively, were already substantially in force (although the form of the oath was a shorter one), in the case of *Archbishops** of England and Ireland during the thirteenth century.

* There is some reason for believing that even English bishops at this period took the oath at their consecration. There is, in 1278, an indult from the Pope to Hugh (Balsham), Bishop of Ely, granting him absolution "from his promise and oath, made at his consecration by Pope Alexander, to visit the Apostolic See every three years." This, however, may be connected with the fact that Hugh Balsham was consecrated at Rome. However, the four-

2. There is evidence that in Ireland in the thirteenth century the archbishops took this oath, not only on receiving the pallium, but at their consecration ("Papal Registers," p. 498).

3. In Scotland (or as Pope Honorius III. in 1218 calls it—the *Ecclesia Scotticana*) in the thirteenth century bishops took the oath at their consecration. We may find a reason for this in the fact that there were no archbishops in Scotland until Sixtus IV. erected St. Andrews into a metropolitan See in 1472, and the Sees of the Scottish Church were "immediately subject to the Roman Church."*

4. Archbishops and bishops of Ireland and bishops of Scotland when consecrated at Rome in the thirteenth century took the oath at their consecrations ("Papal Registers," p. 454, Theiner, 160). A very large proportion of Scottish bishops went to Rome for consecration.

5. In the cases above mentioned—consecrations of English or Irish archbishops and of Scottish bishops—the Bulls† usually make mention of the oath of obedience. There are a number of Bulls in which all mention of the oath is absent. Upon examination these are uniformly found to be cases in which the consecration is mentioned as having taken place in Rome. In Rome, as we know from the cases of Ely and Clonfert, the oath was regularly administered at consecration ("Papal Registers," 454, Theiner, 160). The inference is that when a prelate was consecrated in Rome the fact of his having taken the oath was already assured, and thence the Bulls naturally omit the usual clause referring to it.

A few examples will suffice to show how the Popes counted upon the obedience of the archbishops, and through them regulated the ordinary government of the Church in this country.

In 1198 an indult is granted to the Archbishop of Canterbury to make ordinances to enforce tithes being paid to the parish churches and not to others. An abbot of Waltham has got into a way of keeping the money of the abbey under

teenth century pontifical, which was used by Bishop Lacy of Exeter, proves that a profession of obedience to St. Peter and his vicars, the Roman Pontiffs, preceded the profession of obedience to the See of Canterbury, in the ceremony of Episcopal consecration (Exeter Pontifical, p. 93).

* So Innocent IV. declares in 1253. Theiner, 59, also 159.

† The Mandate to the Consecrator or Pallium Commissioners.

his own personal care. The constitution of the Apostolic See requires that such moneys shall be kept in a bag in the custody of two or three canons. The Archbishop of Canterbury is commanded to associate the Abbots of Chertsey and Cirencester in commission with himself and compel the offending abbot to keep his moneys as he ought to do.

In 1209 the Pope grants a faculty to the Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury to absolve two persons excommunicated for guilt of sacrilege, if they humbly implore the absolution. In the same year the Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury is commanded to examine three of the canons who took part in the election of Hugh, Bishop-elect of Lincoln, and if he find it canonical "he is to confirm it by metropolitical authority; if not he is to report to the Pope, and he is also to make inquiry into the character of the bishop-elect." In 1222, the Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury is commanded by the Pope to make a visitation of his province, and is reminded that he has neglected this part of his office. In 1224, the same Cardinal Archbishop is commanded by Honorius III. to exercise his influence with the king, and to dissuade him from making war upon his own English subjects while England is exposed to danger from foreign enemies. He is to counsel the king to try to get the better of his vassals not so much by force of arms as by benefits. In the same year the Archbishop of York is ordered to associate with himself the Bishops of Carlisle and Exeter, and examine the case of Alan, Constable of Scotland, about the validity of whose marriage doubts have arisen. Alan had appealed to the Pope, who now orders the case to be tried by commission, and charges the episcopal commissioners to examine all persons concerned, and "to do what is according to the law of God and the good of souls." In 1244, the Archbishop of Armagh receives a mandate to examine the election of Master John to the See of Lismore, and, if all be satisfactory, to confirm it. That the Irish Primate may have legal assistance in the matter, Master Martin, clerk of the Papal Camera, is associated with him as co-examiner. In Theiner's "*Vetera Monumenta*" may be seen a large number of similar mandates to the Irish Archbishops, or to local episcopal commissions to examine into the validity of elections to the Irish Sees. In Scotland, where there were no Arch-

bishops until 1472, the Holy See verified and confirmed elections to the Sees by issuing a mandate for the purpose to a commission of neighbouring bishops. Thus in 1208 the Papal writ is sent to the Bishops of Dunkeld and Brechin and the Abbot of Kelso to examine the election of Adam, Bishop-elect of Aberdeen.

When metropolitan Sees were vacant, the same course was followed in Ireland. In 1291 there is a general mandate to the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, Tuam and all their suffragans, to abbots, priors, deans, archdeacons, prelates, chapters, convents and colleges, to give a tenth of their revenues to their king, to enable him to set out for the Holy Land in 1293. These are, of course, but instances of which hundreds might as easily be cited, but they are typical of the various forms in which Papal jurisdiction moved and controlled the archiepiscopal machinery of the Church in these countries.

THE POPE AND THE BISHOPS.

While the Pope thus regulated the higher sphere of church business by the agency of the metropolitans, the volume of direct dealings of Rome with each diocese was hardly less remarkable. A few examples will serve as an illustration.

In 1202 the Bishop of Ely, the Dean of Lincoln and the Archdeacon of Bedford receive from the Pope a commission to investigate certain charges which have been brought against the Archbishop of York. In 1204 John, the master of the hospital at York, appointed by the archbishop, has been removed by the dean and chapter. The Pope commissions the Bishop of Hereford, his dean and precentor, to try the case and decide it.

Matrimonial troubles apparently were not wanting in the thirteenth century. In the year 1205, a certain gentleman, called W., felt himself called to enter a Cistercian monastery and take the monastic habit. He induced his wife to enter a convent. She did so, but, with a prudent prevision of what might happen, refrained from taking vows. Now, as soon as she was safely in, W. came out. He returned to the world and to liberty. Moreover, he refused to take back his wife and "treated her injuriously." The case reached Rome. The

Pope issued a peremptory mandate to the Bishop of Ely and two other commissioners to compel W. to take back his wife forthwith, unless it should be that she is far advanced in years.

In 1219, the Bishop of Winchester receives from the Pope a faculty empowering him to correct certain excesses on the part of the monks. He is informed, moreover, that the Papal Legate has orders to enforce such sentences as he may pronounce against them.

In 1238, the king is anxious to invalidate the election recently made to the See of Durham. The king had made certain charges against the bishop-elect, and had laid them before the archbishop. The archbishop refused to take cognisance of them, whereupon the king has appealed to the Pope. The Pope issues a mandate to the Bishop of Lincoln, the Archdeacon of Northampton, and the Chancellor of St. Paul's, to try the whole case. If the king can prove his charges within two months, they are to annul the election. If he fails to do so, and if they find the election to have been canonically made, they are to confirm it, and order the archbishop to consecrate the bishop-elect.

The following is an instance of how a couple of talkative monks brought trouble on their abbot. In 1224, two monks, R. and W., from the Abbey of Tewkesbury, arrived in Rome. Advisedly or incidentally, they proceeded to describe the magnificence of their abbot whom they had left at home, and related how he was wont to wear mitre, and ring, and gloves, and give the solemn benediction after Mass. And the better to impress their hearers, they appear to have added that he held in his possession Papal letters authorising him to do so. The Pope thereupon issues a mandate to the Bishop of Ely, the Abbot of Waredon and the Archdeacon of Bedford, to go to Tewkesbury and hold a court of inquiry. The Pope further informs the commissioners that the alleged letters do not agree with the transcript in the Papal Chancery, and that never has he given leave to any abbot to wear gloves or give the solemn benediction. The transcript is forwarded, and if the alleged letters, when compared with it, are found to be spurious, those who obtained and used them are to be deprived; but if the letters cannot be found, they are to hold a visitation of the

monastery, and correct whatever has need of correction. It would be really interesting to know what the splendour-loving abbot, deprived of his gloves, had to say to the two monks when they returned to Tewkesbury, or whether his greeting partook of the nature of the solemn benediction.

There is an impression that the Medieval Church was unduly severe in its punishment of crimes committed by the laity against the clergy. The following case does not lend much confirmation to the view. In 1202, a certain Lumberd, a layman, joined in an expedition led by the Earl of Caithness. He stormed a castle belonging to the Bishop of Caithness, and took the bishop himself prisoner. No doubt the bishop had something to say by way of remonstrance. Whereupon Lumberd, at the instance of his fellow-soldiers, seized the bishop and cut out his tongue. Later on, Lumberd repents and makes his way to the Pope. Cutting out a bishop's tongue could hardly be a small offence in days when even striking a cleric meant excommunication, and one waits to see what dire punishment the offended majesty of the Church will devise for the perpetrator. We only learn that the Pope gives him a letter to the Bishop of the Orkneys, commanding the Bishop to receive Lumberd, and see that he performs the penance enjoined on him. After all, there was mercy in the Middle Ages.

In 1219, the Bishop of Carlisle finds that a number of pensions have been illegally granted out of the revenues of the diocese. The Pope sends him an indult to revoke them. In the same year the Bishop of Bath and Wells receives from the Pope a confirmation of an agreement by which are united the churches of Bath and Glastonbury. In 1255, the Bishop of Norwich receives Papal confirmation for his new hospital for aged priests and poor scholars.

To these instances of Papal action in the dioceses, would have to be added the numberless cases of decisions or judgments of capitular disputes and episcopal elections, and the adjustment of the respective rights of the monastic bodies in relation to the Ordinary. It is the habit of certain writers to represent this intervention as sufficiently explained by the ambition or intrusion of the Pope ever ready to override the diocesan authority. A glance at the abstracts in Mr. Bliss's

Calendar, or at the documents in the collections of Theiner and others, would suffice to convince any candid reader that such a view is utterly untenable. In the voluminous mass of evidence, rarely do we see an act of the Pope which can be called *proprio motu*. The mandates are answers to appeals, and the indulgences and faculties are answers to petitions, in which the English bishops, abbots, and chapters themselves took the initiative. They are in nearly every case the first to invoke the exercise of the Pope's authority, and it is childish to suppose that they would have invoked and obeyed an authority in which they did not believe, and which they did not conscientiously recognise. We might well apply to the Medieval English Church the unanswerable remark of the Protestant writer, Kemble, when speaking of Papal jurisdiction as shown by the gift and acceptance of the pallium in the Anglo-Saxon Church. He says, "The question is not whether the Roman See had the right to make the demand, but whether—usurpation or not—it was acquiesced in and admitted by the Anglo-Saxon Church, and on that point there can be no dispute" (Kemble's "Saxons," vol. ii., p. 371, note).

On the other hand, nothing is more marked in these records of the government of the Church in these countries in the thirteenth century, than the constant tendency of the Holy See to judge and act by means of local episcopal commissions. Its policy, as written on the face of these documents, reads not as one of intrusion, but largely as one of devolution, and that especially in the very zenith of Papal power, and during the pontificate of Innocent III. Undoubtedly these collections contain numerous evidences of monetary exactions and subsidies for the Crusades, of provisions for foreign clerics, and of dispensations for pluralities. In whatever measure these were excessive, they are to be frankly condemned and deplored. Yet we are confident that in proportion as English church history is studied, not with partisan bias but in the spirit of thoroughness and justice, not at second-hand from Matthew Paris, but from original, authentic and official documents, a clearer and fairer appreciation of the thirteenth century methods of Church government will obtain. Writers will ask themselves if, after all, it is true that all the moneys deported out of England went simply to the enrichment of the Court of Rome, or that all the

foreigners sent into England were idlers and parasites, or that all the dispensations for pluralities were acts of unjustifiable aggrandisement of individuals. To these questions, three thoughts will rise up in answer—the inestimable service rendered to the defence of Europe by the aggressive policy of the Crusades; the large number of admirable bishops of English Sees who were of foreign origin (Lanfranc, Anselm, St. Hugh of Lincoln); and the large volume of educational and official work maintained by the marginal incomes derived from the tenure of more than one benefice. We do not wish to suggest that these considerations cover the whole ground of complaint, or that they constitute a sufficient justification of all that was done in these three channels of national grievance. On the contrary, there were connected with them abuses which, if they occurred to-day, would draw from our Catholic bishops words of loyal remonstrance and protest much more vehement than any which proceeded from the lips of Grossetete. But we may plead that such extenuations must be fairly taken into account when we draw up the balance-sheet of good and of evil for the English Church in the thirteenth century.

THE POPE AND THE ENGLISH CLERGY AND LAITY.

While the action of the Holy See entered, as we have seen, into the provincial and diocesan mechanism, it radiated at the same time in a special manner to individuals and families in the form of indults, or special favours, and dispensations. The following are a few examples of this connection between individual members of the clergy or the laity and the chief Pastor in Christendom.

In 1221, a poor priest entered a Cistercian monastery in Scotland, and within a month went out of his mind. He has appealed to Rome for protection. Pope Honorius III. issues a mandate to the Abbots of Melrose and Neubottle, to see that the priest is left to his own conscience as to whether or not he shall embrace the monastic life, and that he is to be allowed to stay in the monastery or to leave it just as he may prefer.

In 1226, John, clerk of Walmere, is dispensed by the Pope of the disqualification of illegitimate birth, so that he may receive holy orders.

In 1237, a French abbot agreed to let his English manor of Wolvetee to R., a layman of the diocese of Wells, on condition that he took an oath to remain unmarried. Evidently the abbot was thinking of the reversion of the property, and did not wish that R. should be distracted by the cares of a family to succeed to his inheritance. Pope Gregory IX. sends a mandate to the Dean of Wells and two other commissioners, declaring the oath of celibacy thus taken to be illegal, and commanding them to compel the abbot to relax it.

In the same year, Gilbert, Earl Marshal of England, sends to the Pope the charter of the grant of the patronage of a church to the monastery of St. Mary de Gloria, and the Pope writes to thank the Earl for his donation.

In 1254, Ela of Warwick receives from the Pope a dispensation to marry Philip, son of Alan, a knight, who is related to her in the third degree of affinity.

Alan Villanus married Isabella, daughter of Clement, but after the marriage it was discovered that the parties were third cousins. In 1255, the Pope sends a mandate to their diocesan, the Bishop of Lichfield, to inquire into the facts, and if need be, to grant the requisite dispensation.

John de Beaumont married Agnes, in ignorance of the fact that he and she were related as third cousins. In 1288, Pope Nicholas IV. commands the Archbishop of York to grant the required dispensation, validate the marriage, and declares legitimate past and future offspring.*

In 1252, Margaret, Queen of Scotland, receives a permit to enter, when travelling accompanied by ladies of her suite, Cistercian monasteries and granges, and partake of their hospitality. A faculty, in 1290, is granted to Blanche, Countess of Leicester, to visit a monastery in France, but requires that she shall "be accompanied by twelve matrons." Accompanied by "eight matrons" she may visit any French or English convent of the order of St. Clare, but she or her companions "are not to eat there, nor to pass the night with the sisters."

In 1288, Nicholas IV. grants permission to the Abbot of

* The Canon Law wisely and mercifully declares legitimate the children of a marriage which is found to be null, but in which the contracting parties were in good faith, and unaware of the nullity.

Hyde, in the Diocese of Winchester, and his monks to wear caps of sheepskin during the offices and processions, as the cold in those parts had caused paralysis to many members of the community.

The following is an example of the danger of making vows for other people. Lady de Wooton made a vow that if her child, not yet born, were a son, he should make the pilgrimage to Rome. In 1288, the said son, Sir John de Wooton, now advanced in years, pleads that he is too old and weak to make the journey. Moreover, he is sheriff of Wiltshire and engaged in the king's business. The Pope directs the Bishop of Salisbury to absolve Sir John from the vow, and directs the expense which would have been incurred by the journey to be given to St. Peter's Basilica.

In 1254, Robert Valeant, the king's steward, is allowed the privilege of a portable altar. In 1286, Robert de Vesci, one of the king's knights, is granted the same.

In 1289, the Earl of Lincoln receives from Pope Nicholas IV. the faculty to choose his own confessor, who may absolve him from all sins, except those in which absolution is reserved to the Apostolic See.

These instances, which are chosen at hazard, and not always well chosen, from a large number of recurring cases, may serve to indicate in some way the general scope in which Papal jurisdiction moved and worked in Catholic England.

They enforce a consideration, which in these times of short polemical Church histories, may not be without its value.

Many, we might say nearly all, of the documents we have referred to are of a tenor which carries with it the conviction that Papal jurisdiction in Medieval England was not merely recognised but readily invoked by all classes of the people throughout the three kingdoms. When, for instance, Ela of Warwick wishes to have a dispensation whereby she can marry Philip of Alan, no one imagines that the Pope in Rome offers her one spontaneously or *proprio motu*. He would never have heard of the case at all had not these English families applied for it. Nor, again, would they have done so had they not been taught by their spiritual guides that such was the proper and necessary course to follow. In

fact, the very petition would have proceeded from the diocesan court or under its sanction, just as the indult or mandate was addressed to the diocesan authority in return. Bearing in mind that this case represents the constant and universal practice of the thirteenth century, it would be impossible even to conceive a clergy and laity acting in this way, unless they carried in their conscience the conviction of the truth and validity of the Papal jurisdiction. Hence, we take it, that when writers labour to explain the historical facts of Medieval English life by asserting the "intrusion" and "usurpation" of Papal power, they leave completely untouched one half, and the most important half, of the difficulty. They have still to give to their readers some explanation of the fact that the whole clergy and people of England not only accepted Papal jurisdiction but had themselves constant recourse to it. They are bound in the light of documentary evidence to consider not only what the Pope claimed, but what the English people believed and admitted. In these Papal registers, as in a wealth of contemporary English records, the testimony of the past lies before us. Writers in the future have only to translate, to publish, and to circulate, and it will speak. Its voice will be no uncertain one. It will speak with the loudness of facts. No power upon earth can arrest the path of historical research, and no power upon earth can silence it. No nation can turn away its ear from the tale it has to tell. Sooner or later, the public opinion of this land, nobly vanquished by its own love of light, irresistibly, and willingly or unwillingly, will be brought both to listen and to learn. In those days, the battle of the Faith will still go on, and the tide of doctrinal war will sweep elsewhere, but one part of the field will be won for ever.

J. MOYES.

Science Notices.

Liquid Fuel.—The enterprise of Mr. Holden in advantageously running locomotives fired with liquid fuel on the Great Eastern Railway during the recent coal strike has done much to revive public interest in this important class of fuel. Mr. G. Stockfleth, in a recent paper read before the Society of Arts, gave much valuable information as to the kind of oil suitable for a successful fuel, and its supply.

Liquid fuel to be practicable must be inexpensive and safe. It must be capable of developing heat and undergoing complete combustion without producing unpleasant smells, smoke, or noxious gases. These requisites can only be found in the oils derived from coal and crude petroleum. The oil derived from coal is unfortunately not produced in sufficient quantities for anything like a general consumption, though it was the form of fuel employed by the Great Eastern Railway Company, who got their oil tanks filled from various gas works along the line. Therefore, practically, the only available present source is crude petroleum. When crude petroleum is distilled it gives off a series of hydrocarbons, known as gasoline, benzoline, kerosene and others. The distillates which evaporate at a low temperature are the most inflammable, and gradually as the temperature is raised the less inflammable oils are distilled. When the temperature in the stills reaches 300° to 320° centigrade, the hydrocarbon called kerosene comes off, and the residue, which in Russian is called *astatki*, forms the oil so admirably fitted for liquid fuel and so largely used in Russia for the purpose. *Astatki* contains all the heavy hydrocarbons capable of creating heat, and, being freed from the inflammable liquids, is perfectly safe. A burning match is instantly extinguished when plunged into it, and to make the fuel burn it has to undergo special treatment. Owing to its safe properties, in Baku it is stored in large open excavations in the ground, containing 5,000,000 poods each, which is equal to over 100,000 tons. The crude Russian petroleum yields about 35 per cent. benzoline, gasoline, and kerosene, the remaining 65 per cent. being available for manufacturing lubricating oils and the fuel. In Russia *astatki* is used for many ships on the Black Sea and in all steamers on the Caspian sea, while all locomotives in Southern Russia use it. The extent of its use in that country is shown by the fact that the transport of *astatki*

from Baku to the Caspian seaports and Astrakan amounted in 1892 to 107,361,435 poods, which is equal to 3,000,000 tons, and in addition to this 250,000 tons were shipped from Batoum. The figures for 1893 will probably show an increase. This tonnage does not include the consumption in Baku, which amounts to over 100,000 tons yearly. Astatki is the only fuel used at the boring of the wells and for all distillery purposes. It is also used to some extent for domestic warming and cooking stoves. From a tank placed at the top of a house a system of pipes leads the oil to the various stoves, where it drips on to a small cast-iron disc placed in front of the stove door, which has a small opening in it for the purpose of making a draught. When the plate is warm and the dripping of the oil is well regulated the fuel burns without attention. When the fuel is used for boiler and distilling purposes, it is necessary the oil should be sprayed so that it can be easily ignited and burn fiercely. There have been many patents taken out in Russia for injectors or pulverisators, but a simple arrangement answers the purpose. One half-inch pipe leads the oil from a tank, the other steam from a boiler, the ends of the pipe are flattened by a hammer and then tied together. The steam jet catches the outflowing oil, and forms the spray. The openings in the pipes are about $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch long and $\frac{1}{8}$ inch to $\frac{1}{6}$ inch wide. This somewhat primitive arrangement can be improved in appearance by arranging the oil pipe inside the steam pipe and providing it with a brass nozzle. Compressed air has been used for pulverising the oil instead of steam.

There are many advantages gained by the use of liquid fuel. It can be readily adapted to any boiler that has been designed for firing with coal, and oil can be used alternately with coal if desired. When oil is used the fire bars have to be taken out or covered with thin slabs and cylinders, and a hole has to be made in the furnace door for the nozzle of the pulverisator. As regards the steam generating power of liquid fuel, Mr. Stockfleth states that one ton of astatki is equal to more than two tons of coal. This comparison must, however, depend upon the quality of oil and coal used. When oil is used the fire can be extinguished instantaneously, and absolutely free from smoke and ashes. It is unnecessary to frequently open the furnace doors, so there is a saving of heat and the prevention of leakage of tubes due to currents of cold air. It is possible to raise steam very rapidly, and there is complete control over the fire. The waste of steam by the safety valve is thus avoided, and a better regulation of boiler pressure is secured. In the case of railways there is less space taken up by the storage of liquid fuel than is required for the coal supply. There is also a saving of labour, for the

oil can be taken into the locomotives simultaneously with the water supply. Then there is an increased comfort to passengers, by the avoidance of smoke and the blowing of safety valves. The stoker in an oil-driven locomotive has a comparatively easy time of it, even on an express train. His work simply consists in giving the regulating valve of the injector a turn from time to time. In the case of steamships the advantages of using liquid fuel are still more obvious. A great deal of space usually devoted to the coal bunkers can be saved. The oil can be conveniently kept in ballast tanks at the bottom of the ship, which gives stability to the vessel, and the oil can gradually be replaced by water. A much smaller stoke-hold is required, and the number of stokers can be reduced in the proportion of one to four. During storms, if water gets access to the stoke-hold and puts the fire out, the oil fire can be more quickly relighted than a coal fire, and there is less risk of accidents from scalding. The principal sources of liquid fuel are the American and Russian oil-fields, though there are more limited oil industries in Burmah, Canada, Galicia, Sumatra, Java, Japan, and Peru. The American oil-fields were first worked in 1859, while the Russian fields were not started until twenty years later. The American and Russian fields differ considerably in the class of crude oil they produce. The American oil gives about 80 per cent. of kerosene, and the remainder is available for making other petroleum products, including liquid fuel.

The Russian crude oil gives only about 35 per cent. of kerosene and other products, leaving 65 per cent. of astatki. Hence it is not surprising that it is in Russia that the use of this kind of fuel is so prominent. The method of boring the wells and the form of the wells is different in the two countries on account of the different geological formation. In America the wells are often drilled through rock from top to bottom, the average diameter at the top is 8 inches and the depth about 2500 feet. In Russia a well is about 24 inches in diameter at the top, and the depth is only about 800 feet. In boring for oil in new fields it is a wiser principle to test the territory by several borings at a comparatively moderate depth of about 500 feet, than by a few borings at great depths such as 2000 feet. The cost of plant, amount of skill, and the time involved progress at much quicker rate than the depth. After making deep borings at great cost there is the chance that the output does not justify the outlay.

In spite of the many advantages that liquid fuel possesses, it does not seem likely that it will be used to any general extent in this coal-producing country, except perhaps as a temporary expedient during

coal strikes. Its cost seems to be prohibitive, even if it could be obtained at as low a price as 2*d.* a gallon, which is doubtful. This figure represents 46*s.* 8*d.* per ton, and allowing the oil to have twice the calorific value, that would be equal to coal at 23*s.* per ton, which is considerably more than is paid for the best steam coal. It is in countries where coal is expensive that markets will be created. There are several parts within the British dominions where oil is found on the spot and coal is expensive, so there is sufficient encouragement for fresh enterprise in this direction. Liquid fuel will, however, be probably used at home to some extent as a luxury. On account of its cleanliness it should find great favour with the possessors of steam yachts and launches. For underground railway lines it should be invaluable, as it would not produce the sulphurous fumes for which our underground railways are notorious. It commends itself for naval use in torpedo boats, wherein economy of space and possibility of quickly raising steam is of the greatest importance, while the absence of smoke in avoiding detection would be an invaluable protection.

Cyclonic Fogs.—The rule that foggy weather is attended with anti-cyclonic conditions like most others appears to have its exceptions. In the paper which Mr. Robert H. Scott read last year before the Royal Meteorological Society on "Fifteen Years' Fogs in the British Islands," he drew attention to the exceptional kind of fog which is reported with such strong winds as are represented by the forces of 6, 7, 8 on Beaufort's scale. During the fifteen years, 1876–1890, 128 of these fogs were reported, compared with 1571 in calm weather. The interest which was awakened in the subject during the discussion following the paper, led Mr. Scott to further investigate what he considers to be a somewhat obscure phenomenon. As cyclones press rather closely upon anti-cyclones, he considers it difficult to decide to which system the reputed fog properly belongs—whether to the cyclone or the anti-cyclone. He has, however, attempted to form an opinion in the case of each observation of fogs with strong winds during the fifteen years. The total number of fogs with strong winds given in the original paper was 128, but subsequent inquiry has added seven to the list, and the total now given for the fifteen years is 135. Out of this number he thinks that 108 were really cyclonic, while 27 were anti-cyclonic or doubtful. The cyclonic fogs are generally attended with precipitation, which is not a characteristic of anti-cyclonic fogs. Of the 27 cases of anti-cyclonic, or doubtful fogs, 21 were dry. Of the 108 cases of

cyclonic fogs, only 30 were dry, and 78 were either accompanied with, or followed immediately by, rain, the amount being sometimes considerable.

Another feature of these fogs is that they are often attended with temperatures agreeing with the maximum temperature of the day. Out of 108 cyclonic fogs, 61 was thus characterised. This is not found to be the case with ordinary anti-cyclonic fogs. These usually take place with a clear sky above them. These cyclonic fogs sometimes occur with actual gales and sometimes precede rough weather. Mr. Scott is of opinion that they are useful as a prognostic of weather; a fog with quickly falling barometer indicating that a gale is approaching our coasts. As the majority of these fogs occur with south-westerly winds, and they are more prevalent on the south-west coast than anywhere else, Mr Scott concludes that their origin is the Atlantic Ocean. He is of opinion that the phenomenon should not be called fog but rather mist; being in most cases dense rain. The Royal Meteorological Society are, however, still discussing the question of the difference between fog and mist, and are still as far from coming to a conclusion as when distinction between these terms was first suggested.

New Industrial Uses of Carbonic Acid.—The liquefaction of carbonic acid has opened out several industrial uses for this chemical agent. By its means it appears to be possible to preserve butter for some weeks. The butter is placed in a metallic vessel fitted with a tube and stop-cock. Carbonic acid is injected into the vessel at a pressure of six atmospheres and displaces the air. The butter being in an inactive atmosphere remains as fresh as the day it was made, for at least five weeks.

If whey is saturated with carbonic acid it is transformed into an effervescing and refreshing beverage, while it retains its nutritive properties. It can be put into syphons like the ordinary aerated waters and keeps for six weeks.

M. A. d'Arsonval finds that carbonic acid at high pressures will displace various organic and mineral acids. If a tube of silicate of potassium is submitted to its action it is found to be full of silicic acid in a gelatinous state. A solution of iodide of potassium is coloured yellow by the displacement of the iodine. The same result occurs with bromides and chlorides. Sulphuric acid, however, is not displaced by carbonic acid, even at a pressure of forty atmospheres.

E. B.

The meeting of the British Association, which took place in August, was indebted for its success in great measure to the circumstance that it was held at Oxford, and under the Presidency of Lord Salisbury, the Chancellor of the ancient and renowned University. This it was probably that attracted so many foreign *savants*, as well as such a number of English ladies, to the great scientific gathering. Oxford, one of the most remarkable cities in the world, has nevertheless no monster building capable of holding a vast audience easily: the Sheldonian Theatre, where the Presidential address was delivered, holds but a limited number; but those who gained admittance must have been struck by the brilliancy of the spectacle, the doctors and other graduates of the University wearing their full academical costume, and Lord Salisbury himself appearing in his robes as Chancellor. His address, besides the important matter it contained, was composed with good taste and in choice language; and it was delivered with that fine clear voice which he has the happiness of possessing. Commencing by an almost playful allusion to the dilemma in which he was placed, having to act in two capacities, Chancellor and President, he then touched on the great change that had taken place in the tone of feeling since the meeting of the Association at Oxford in 1832, when so amiable a man as Mr. Keble was sorely vexed at the bestowal of the honorary degree of D.C.L. on certain distinguished men of science, such as Brown-Brewster, Faraday, and Dalton; but he thought the antipathy arose from the fact that the University and the Association each taught science, but used the word in different senses—the Oxford sense being that of the knowledge which was so highly prized in the Middle Ages, and which was founded on the teaching of Aristotle: Lord Salisbury alluded also to the stormy meeting of the Association at Oxford in 1860—celebrated for the encounter that occurred between the late Bishop Wilberforce and Professor Huxley; and intimated his opinion that religion and science are not at the present day supposed to be in antagonism with each other, in the sense that questions of religious belief depend on the results of physical research—an opinion, we may observe, that although partially true is not, we fear, quite in accordance with the real facts of the case. He then proceeded to say that whereas former Presidents of the British Association usually gave a history of their own special branch of science, he on the contrary would touch on those points on which our knowledge was still deficient, “the undiscovered country which still remains to be won.”

We believe we are right in supposing that chemistry is a favourite pursuit of Lord Salisbury; and he takes first of the “scientific enigmas
[No. 12 of *Fourth Series*.]

which "defy solution" the nature and origin of the elements, of which chemists recognise about sixty-five; and he says, "we cannot conceive, on any possible doctrine of cosmogony, how these sixty-five elements came into existence." There appears to be no foundation for the theory that the atoms of each element consist of so many atoms or half atoms of hydrogen. Nor has spectral analysis, with all its marvellous discoveries, solved our difficulty as to the nature of the atoms; though it "has taught us things of which the world little expected to be told," such as the vast speed with which some of the stars are moving; and it has given us some information about the elementary atoms themselves: we have learnt from it that the elements existing in the sun and stars are mainly those with which we are familiar here on earth; but nitrogen and oxygen, such important terrestrial elements, are absent from the spectrum of the sun; this last fact being a difficulty for those who believe in the nebular hypothesis; Lord Salisbury, however, does not allude to the possibility that these substances, which we think are elementary, may conceivably be dissociated by the high temperature of the sun and appear under some still more elementary forms. The upshot is that the researches of Dalton, Kirchhoff, Mendeléef and others have failed to explain what the atom of each element is, "whether a movement, or a thing, or a vortex, or a point having inertia."

The next subject the address deals with is the *ether*; and it is described not untruly as a "half-discovered entity." It is of course one of the mysteries of science: when the highly probable truth of the undulatory theory of light was fairly recognised, it followed that there must be something to *undulate*; and so "the notion of the ether was conceived." But "even its solitary function of undulating ether performs in an abnormal fashion"; and though it may be true that the undulations which convey light, convey also the electric impulse, this supposition is not without its difficulties. So that the conclusion that Lord Salisbury puts before us seems to be that the very existence of the ether is only a matter of inference, sound and legitimate though that inference may be.

His next instance of the obscurity that still hangs over problems "which the highest intellects have been investigating" is that of life, both animal and vegetable. We do not know what that "vital force" is which causes the whole difference between a really living organism and any artificial production assuming to imitate it. The triumphs of biology have been great, but they "give at present no hope of penetrating the great central mystery."

The latter part of Lord Salisbury's address was the portion calculated to excite controversy. He had already alluded parenthe-

tically to "the comfortable word 'evolution,' one of those indefinite words, from time to time vouchsafed to humanity, which have the gift of alleviating so many perplexities, and masking so many gaps in our knowledge." And he now proceeded to make some criticisms on the theory to which Darwin has given his name; this he did with great tact and ability; he denied none of the conclusions at which modern men of science have arrived, or think they have arrived; he paid a high tribute to the character of Darwin; he admitted the collapse of the doctrine of the immutability of species, and even allowed that animals now separated still more widely may yet have descended from a common ancestor; but he granted no more: the extent to which this common descent can be assumed, and the process by which it has come about, are still doubtful questions. He pointed out some of the principal difficulties against which Darwin's theory of natural selection has to contend: the first being the formidable difficulty, based on astronomical reasons, and leading to the conclusion that there has not been nearly sufficient time since organic life first appeared on the earth, to admit of evolution by natural selection to the extent required for the production of all the various types that we now see; if (as Darwin believed) all animals are descended from at most four or five progenitors. Astronomers hesitate in admitting such an appalling number of millions of years for the past history of the earth, for one or two good and substantial reasons. One reason is drawn from the fact that there has been a minute but sure process going on, owing to the friction of the tides, by which the daily revolution of the earth on its own axis has been (and still is) becoming longer; but this is a process which we cannot suppose to have been in action for such vast periods of time as geologists and biologists imagine, and the date at which the earth assumed its present form as a habitation for living organisms must not be put so far back. The reason, however, on which Lord Salisbury dwells (for he scarcely touches on the one we have just mentioned) is the gradual cooling of the earth from a far higher temperature than that now existing; and he might have added, of the sun also. Lord Kelvin and Professor Tait have called attention to this fact, which—at least so far as the earth is concerned—must be treated as certain; and this being the case, the earth has not been habitable during all the hundreds of millions of years that are required by the Darwinian theory for the work of evolution. Still it must be remembered that the geologists—not without considerable show of reason—maintain a contrary opinion; and Lord Salisbury refrains from any decision other than a verdict of "not proven." He considers in fact that the gravest objection to the doctrine of

natural selection is one which he quotes from an unguarded statement (so at least it strikes us as being) from Professor Weismann in a paper recently published, to the effect that we must accept natural selection "not because we are able to demonstrate the process in detail, not even because we can with more or less ease imagine it," but "because it is the only possible explanation that we can conceive"—and because otherwise we must assume "the help of a principle of design."

This appears, indeed, to be a great confession of weakness, and Lord Salisbury makes the most of it; as a politician he knows the argument well, but it has no place in science. A process which we not only cannot demonstrate in detail but cannot even imagine, is "purely hypothetical." "No man, so far as we know, has ever seen it at work." "No man, or succession of men, have ever observed the whole process in any single case, and certainly no man has ever recorded the observation." The argument drawn from *artificial* selection (which has been so much used) does not here fully apply, as he points out, for there you can select the right mates to produce the required variation, whereas with animals in a state of nature, you are left to chance, so that if the process is to take place at all, you do require an "immeasurable expanse of time." Lord Salisbury then accepts Weismann's dictum that if natural selection be rejected, we must fall back on the mediate or immediate agency of design, and concludes his address with some eloquent words, quoted from Lord Kelvin, alluding to the strong proofs of design lying around us, and "teaching us that all living things depend on one everlasting Creator and Ruler."

The usual vote of thanks to the President was moved by Lord Kelvin in a purely non-contentious speech, in which he observed that there was "a still greater mystery than any which was to be found in connection with any physical science, and that was the mystery of the human will."

The vote was seconded by Professor Huxley, in whom the old combative spirit has not quite died out, but who was obliged to clothe his remarks in the language of compliment, since the etiquette of the British Association forbids any hostile criticism of the President's address. Availing himself then of Lord Salisbury's admission as to the mutability of species and the probable descent of animals, now separated still more widely, from a common ancestry, he welcomed him as a distinguished convert to the doctrine of evolution; and he remarked with some truth that these points were the fundamental principles of evolution, which was not to be confounded with Darwinism.

Lord Salisbury, with some adroitness, in a few brief sentences, acknowledging the vote of thanks, said that Mr. Huxley's observation had confirmed him in the opinion that when men of science seem to differ widely from each other it is because they do not accurately understand the meaning of the words they are respectively using.

There can be no doubt, notwithstanding all the complimentary language appropriate to the occasion, that Lord Salisbury's attack was felt to be a real one: it found an echo moreover to some extent in public opinion, and the biologists of the school of Darwin will probably reply to it. It is of course true that evolution may be held, quite apart from the theory of natural selection, as a probable hypothesis, and that it has been so held by some naturalists; but it is also true that this theory, as expounded by Darwin, Wallace, and others, has appeared to give an intelligible explanation of it, as working by the ordinary laws which for countless ages have governed, and still govern, the physical universe. If you take away this explanation you destroy the backbone of the system of evolution; you do not of course overthrow it altogether, but you limit its operation and you weaken the whole thing to an indefinite extent.

We cannot here discuss at length the difficulties suggested by Lord Salisbury; but the simple fact that during the few thousand years of which we have historical records, evolution *has not been observed* to take place (unless in a very modified sense of the word), seems to us exactly contrary to what we should expect to find if Darwinism were true.

Evolution to a limited extent, and in a qualified sense, and natural selection also, are things that no one need hesitate to admit; but as regards the system as interpreted by the modern biologists, we concur in Lord Salisbury's verdict of "not proven."

The addresses of the presidents of the various sections of the Association were on the whole less interesting than usual to the general public. That of Professor Rücker to the Section of Mathematics and Physics dealt with terrestrial magnetism and the magnetic survey of the United Kingdom, in which Dr. Thorpe and himself had been engaged. The Chemical, Geological, and Biological Sections were presided over by Professor Dixon, Mr. Fletcher, and Professor Balfour respectively, the last named having chosen for his subject the advantage of a system of scientific forestry. Captain Wharton, R.N., hydrographer to the Admiralty, addressed the Geographical Section on some topics of a more popular character—ocean currents, ocean temperature, and the depth of the sea, which last does not *generally* exceed 4000 fathoms or four sea miles, though in the case

of one sounding, a depth of 4655 fathoms (27,930 feet) has been found: he also touched upon the tides, a much more complicated phenomenon than is commonly supposed.

Professors Bastable, Kennedy, and Schäfer presided over the Sections of Economic Science and Statistics, Mechanical Science, and Physiology respectively; the first mentioned of these made some judicious remarks about "Collective Socialism," a product of the factory and workmen's club, tending to substitute the artificial authority of the State for the natural element of society, the family. The address of Sir W. H. Flower, President of the Section of Anthropology, was of an interesting nature; touching as it did on the study of the modification of the human body under various circumstances of age, sex, race, &c., which is now called anthropometry: and this led to some remarks on the "Bertillon" system (as it is called in France) for identifying criminals by taking exact measurements between certain points of the bony framework of the body, which do not change even under different conditions of life:—a system said to be more effective than photography for this purpose. Sir W. Flower also called attention to a subject lately elaborated by Mr. Francis Galton, namely, that of finger-marks; for it appears that the little ridges and furrows on the under-surface of our fingers are full of significance as distinctive marks of individuals; and he observed that the Tichborne case might have easily been settled (in *theory*, we suppose he means) if Roger Tichborne, before starting on his voyage, had imprinted his thumb on a piece of blackened paper.

In most of the sections there were some important papers read and discussions held: we have not, however, space to notice more than a few of them; some were connected with advanced mathematics, or were otherwise of a strictly technical character: for instance, one on the subject of "integrators" and other similar instruments adapted for calculating the areas enclosed by certain curves.

The announcement of the discovery of a gas hitherto unknown in the atmosphere, made by Lord Rayleigh to the Chemical Section on behalf of himself and Professor Ramsay, was considered to be in some respects the principal event of the meeting. It exists only in a small quantity and is said to be denser than nitrogen.

The most interesting discussion in a popular point of view was perhaps that on Mr. Maxim's Flying Machine. The inventor was himself present, and took part in the proceedings. We confess we were surprised to find that the scientific men who spoke on this question, including Lord Rayleigh and Lord Kelvin, were mostly of opinion that the machine *might* eventually succeed. One or two

expressed considerable doubt, but the general opinion was rather favourable. It is not the absurdity some people imagine it to be nor does it contradict any known law of mechanics; but we are somewhat sceptical as to its practical success, above all as to its being applicable to military purposes, as Mr. Maxim is so sanguine as to expect: for what General would sanction the use of a machine that might probably destroy more of his own men than those of the enemy? In the Biological Section some important papers were read on Evolution and Darwinism: one being by Professor D'Arcy Thompson on "Some Difficulties of Darwinism," in which he discussed the question of the Adequacy of Natural Selection to effect the variations attributed to its action.

On the same day Professor Lodge read to the physicists and chemists (combined) a paper on Clerk Maxwell's theory of light, and on an electrical theory of the action of light on the retina of the eye.

Mr. Devas's paper on the "Identification of Rent and Interest," read before the Economic Section, and one from Mr. Herbert Weld Blundell before the Geographical Section on his expedition to the oases in the Libyan desert, are well deserving of notice. A criticism of Croll's views on the Ice-age, by Mr. Culverwell, excited some interest. There was, however, perhaps no paper more interesting, connected with the discussion that followed it, than one by Professor Rupert Jones, before the geologists and anthropologists (combined) on certain flint instruments that have been found in Kent; and the question arose how far these flints were the work of man and how far that of Nature; also how far their position when found, even if they be admitted to be human handiwork, could be treated as evidence of their age. There is still a difference of opinion on these points; but it is curious to note the reaction that seems to be at least partially setting in against the scientific dogmatism that prevailed thirty years ago, when great stress was laid on these flint implements as proving the antiquity of man on the earth. We do not of course attempt to discuss this important subject, as to which there are other arguments besides the flint-weapons, but we strongly suspect that the hasty conclusions that were formed as to these latter will be seriously shaken as time goes on and fuller investigation takes place.

The next meeting of the Association is to be held at Ipswich, and Sir Douglas Galton is to be the new President.

F. R. W. P.

Nova et Vetera.

THE ROSARY.

THE devotion which the Catholic Church in England before the Reformation had for the Rosary (or as it was then often called the Psalter of Our Lady) is attested by the following poem, written in the fifteenth century, at the end of a MSS. volume of monastic Legenda, and preserved in the British Museum :*

DE ROSARIO BTE MARIE VIRGINIS CARMEN.

Mater Nati mirifici eterni Patris lilium,
 Es Neumatis almifici mirabile triclinium,
 Aurora surgens dulciter, tetros illustrans homines.
 Qui dicunt ave iugiter, dampni non sint participes.
 Kore infunde gracie dicenti sertum roseum ;
 Pro hoc stabis in acie qui fert tuum psalterium.
 In quinquaginta textitur ave sertum virgineum
 In tribus sertis nectitur psalterii triclinium.
 Ad decem ave dic Pater noster cotidie quindecies
 Ut numerum annualiter plagarum X^{ti} celebres.
 Mire prodest psalterium. Scelestis pœnitenciam,
 Lassus dat refrigerium : lugentibus gaudenciam.
 Alligatos alleviat : dura laxans compedia.
 Temptatosque tranquillat, egentes ab inedia :
 Tenorem observantie, religiosiis fratribus
 Copiamque scientie devotis dat scholaribus.
 Excludens est pœnalia ; regni et territorii
 Mala fert infernalia ; pœnasque purgatorii ;
 Rite dictum dæmonibus infert confusibilia
 Sanctis honore omnibus largitur perutilia.
 Ihesu ergo concinnite ut cœlum consequamini
 Marie quoque psallite ad pola ut ductamini.

REPETITIO.

Eia cari ! velle non dispari hinc asseramus iugiter
 Ave Maria gratia, ut ad cœli palacia tendamus persuaviter.

It will be sufficient for the purpose of these pages, if I subjoin a more or less literal translation of the above lines, leaving it open to any reader of this REVIEW, who may possess the required afflatus, to restore the pious thoughts contained in them to the higher realm of poetry :

O Mother of the wonder-working Child, lily of the Eternal Father,
 Thou art the admirable guest-chamber of the purifying Spirit.

* Additional MSS. 6716, f. 142b.

O rising dawn, sweetly lighting up the sinful human race.
 Let not harm reach those who ever bid thee hail.
 Pour down the dew of grace on those who say thy Rosary.
 Be thou defender of all who wear thy psalter.
 In fifty Aves is woven the Virgin's garland.
 In three garlands is linked the triplet of the Rosary.
 For each ten Aves say Pater Noster thrice five times daily.
 Thus the number of Christ's wounds thou wilt honour endlessly.
 Of wondrous profit is the Rosary. To the sinner it brings penance,
 And to the weary, rest, and to the weeping, joy.
 Relieves the captive, loosing from his feet the fetters hard.
 And peace gives to the tempted. From their poverty it lifts the
 poor.
 To religious brethren it gives fervour of observance,
 And to scholars devout the plentiness of knowledge.
 Punishment it averts; from country and from kingdom.
 Keeps hellish evils and purgatory's pains.
 Devoutly said, it carries confusion to the devils.
 While with honour to all Saints it bringeth profit.
 Sing therefore, to Jesu, that Heaven thou mayst obtain
 And sing to Mary also, that thither thou mayst be guided.

REFRAIN.

Come then! dear ones, with will that wearies not,
 Let us unceasing say
 "Hail Mary full of grace."
 That to the Heavenly place
 We may sweetly tend our way.

In this same MS., immediately preceding the above, there is written, evidently by the same author, or some one much influenced by him, a species of Acrostic, or as the writer calls it, a "most true Etymology." Apparently distrustful of the intelligence of the reader, he is careful to put its significance beyond all possibility of mistake by the line of large letters in the margin:

Sequitur decem Privilegia
 Psalterii Beate Marie Virginis
 secundum verissimam eiusdem
 Nominis mirifici Ethimologiam pro
 Beate Marie veneratione
 sertissimam.

Primo sui Psalterii est prestans peccatoribus poenitentiam	qz	P
Secundo. Sicientibus Stillans Satiacionem	qz	S
Tertio. Alligatos Alliciens Absolutionem	qz	A
Quarto. Lugientibus Linquens Leticiam	qz	L
Quinto. Temptatis Tradens Tranquillitatem	qz	T
Sexto. Egenorum Expellens Egestatem	qz	E
Septimo. Religiosis Reddens Reformationem	qz	R
Octavo. Ignorantibus Indicens Intelligentiam	qz	I
Nono. Vivis Vincens Vastationem	qz	U
Decimo. Mortuis Mittens Misericordiam	qz	M

In translating this, the acrostic element to which the ancient author attaches so much value, of course, disappears.

Here follow the ten benefits
of the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary
According to a most true Etymology of the
wonderful name of the same, and
most profitable for the veneration of Blessed Mary.

First, the Rosary gives repentance to sinners.
Secondly. It gives to those who desire, that which they long for.
Thirdly. It obtains freedom for the captive.
Fourthly. It brings joy to the mournful.
Fifthly. It gives peace to the tempted.
Sixthly. It relieves the want of the poor.
Seventhly. It works the reformation of religious.
Eighthly. It gives knowledge to the ignorant.
Ninthly. It overcomes the calamities of the living.
Tenthly. It obtains mercy for the dead.

We can well imagine that the pious fifteenth century author would tell us that our translation is a poor one at the best, and that we have fairly succeeded in spoiling his work and in robbing it of its chief charm in leaving all the alliterative ingenuity of his beautiful "acrostic" in the original Latin behind us. If so, we might make some amends and recover the acrostic by departing from the translation. For instance, we could even imagine a preacher or a devout client of the Rosary in our own day taking the author for his master, and fixing a few of the advantages of the devotion in his mind by some such mnemonic as the following :

The Rosary renders Relief to the Repentant.	.	.	which is R
It Obtains Order and Obedience for the Obdurate	.	.	which is O
It Soothes the Sadness of the Sorrowful	.	.	which is S
It Allays the Anxiety of the Anguished	.	.	which is A
It Restores Repose to Restless	.	.	which is R
It Yields You the grace which You Yearn for	.	.	which is Y

The reader will feel that he could have made ten like that for himself, and all of them much more successfully, and that the above is a terrible sacrifice of substance to form ; but at least such an example may serve to give a clearer idea of the purpose of the "most true etymology," and of its usefulness to the English Catholic people at a time when books were relatively few, and the masses were taught to read from their memory.* For an admirable description of a

* On the same page the author recommends the following pious practice. He takes the first fifteen letters of the alphabet. He attaches to each an adjective in the superlative relating to God (Amantissime, Benignissime, Clementissime, Dulcissime, Elegantissime, Familiarissime, Gloriosissime, Honorabilissime, Innocentissime, Karissime, Laudabilissime, Misericordissime, Nobilissime, Omnipotentissime, Piissime). He then adds, "Join to these fifteen adjectives 'O Jesu,' with an uplifting of the heart (suspirio) and a prayer to share in some measure in these qualities of thy God."

a fifteenth-century Rosary Book, I would refer all who are interested in the history of the devotion, to an article by the Rev. Fr. A. Gasquet, O.S.B., in the *Downside Review* of December 1893.

In the earlier decades of the eighteenth century, when the shadow of the penal laws still hung heavily over the land, there were devoted missionaries busy at their work, and here and there doing their best to maintain the old tradition of English devotion to the Rosary.

Amongst the MSS. in the British Museum are the transcripts of the register of a certain Dominican friar, Father James Dominic Derbyshire, who laboured in this country between the years 1727 and 1755.* Apparently, the good father had for his base of operations three Catholic centres in Lancashire, Suffolk, and Devonshire. He kept a register of the names of the persons he baptized, and to save the trouble of keeping a second book, he entered amongst the baptisms, just as they came, the names of those whom he enrolled in the Confraternity of the Rosary. But the more easily to pick out the latter, he carefully put in the margin opposite the name of the person enrolled, a circle of small o's to represent a rosary. He also added the number of the enrolment. I suppose none of our bishops in making their visitations would tolerate such a system of keeping registers nowadays, but those were times when priests were only emerging from a condition of things in which they well might hesitate to put anything in writing. Even then, Fr. Derbyshire seems to have shrunk from making the entries in English, or even in Latin, for he has taken the precaution of writing them in Flemish.

The MSS. volume is entitled

The Register of Baptisms, Marriages, admissions into the Confraternity of the Rosary, &c. kept by the Rev. Fr. James Dominic Derbyshire, O.P., Roman Catholic chaplain at Standish Hall, Lancashire, Gifford Hall, Suffolk, and Ugbrooke Park, near Chudleigh in Devonshire, from the year 1727 to 1755, transcribed from the original.

I copy the beginning, and, as a sample, a few of the entries.

Een Bocksten van de gedoopten & ingeschreven in het Roosencrans by Ja. Derbyshire 1728.†

* Additional MSS. No. 32632.

† A small book of the baptized and the enrolled in the Rosary by Ja. Derbyshire, 1728.

July 28, 1728. I have baptized Ann Brown, daughter of Alexander Brown, in the parish of Standish. The godmother was N. Taylor, daughter of Oliver Taylor, of the same parish.

¹O Aug. 15, 1728. Enrolled Maria Radcliff: present Ann Clarisse of Roan.

Jan. 8, 1728^s. I have baptized Thomas Spaal, the son of N. Spaal, of the parish of —, by Ipswich. Mrs. Baldwin, grandmother of the child was godmother, and her son Robert was godfather.

- July 28, 1728. Ick hebbe gedoopt Ann Brown, dochter van Alexander Brown van Standish parochie; de Meter was N. Taylor, dochter van Oliver Taylor, van de selve parochie.
- ¹○ Aug. 15, 1728. Ingeschreven Maria Radcliff; legenwoordigh Anne Clarisse tot Roan.
- Jan. 8, 172^s. Ick hebb gedoopt Thomas Spaal den sone van N. Spaal, van de p'rochie van — by Ipswich. Jouff Baldwin, Groetmeter van het kindt was Meter & haen sone Robert was Peter.
- ²○ Aug. 4, 1729. Ingeschreven my lady Frances Mannock.
- ³○ May 17, 1730. Ingeschreven Ursula Pashley.
- ⁴○ May 18, 1730. Ingeschreven Mrs. Mary Ram & Mrs. Juliana Cawell.
- ⁵ May 24. Ingeschreven Elizabeth Taylor.
- ⁶○ May 31. Ingeschreven Mrs. Mary Bogis van Boxford.
- ⁷○ June 11. Ingeschreven Mrs. Mary Baldwin.
Mrs. Ann Spaal.⁸
Mrs. Francis Osburn.⁹

After a number of Baptisms, come the following entries :

- Aug. 9. Ingeschreven Edmond Gardener.¹³
April 30, 1733. Ingeschreven Catherine Wilkinson tot Wiggan.
(at Wigan.)

Altogether in the earlier part of this register there are some forty-four names. These are faithful English Catholics, the grandfathers of whose grandfathers said their rosaries in the days of Queen Mary, and the grandchildren of whose grandchildren are living—perhaps saying their rosary—at the present time.

How widely would these early eighteenth-century Catholics have opened their eyes in rapturous surprise could they have beheld in spirit the vision of the Catholic Church in England as she stands at the present day ! Who shall say that less would be *our* joy and wonderment were it given to us to behold the Catholic Church in England as she will stand before this country some two centuries to come ?

J. MOYES.

THE BIDDING OF THE BEDES.

IN describing this well-known feature of Catholic worship in the English pre-Reformation Church, certain writers, while seeking to trace its origin in earlier Eastern liturgies, have asserted that it was entirely absent from the formularies of the Church in Rome. This is counted upon as an indication that the English liturgical forms have their derivation from Eastern rather than from Roman

sources. A simple investigation of the data will show how far this theory is justified by facts.

1. Let us first divest the term of a certain ambiguity. The Bidding Prayer may mean :

- (a) The Bidding Prayer as used in the fifteenth century and found in manuals, &c., of that date.
- (b) The ritual institution of Bidding Prayer, the thing itself—viz., a form of prayer so arranged that an ecclesiastical person “bids” the people pray for a variety of objects in succession, to each of which “biddings” the people respond by a prayer, commonly a short ejaculation (strictly speaking, there is no reason why this class should not include a “bid” and a prayer recited by one person only in the name of the rest).

In the sense of (a) the Bidding Prayer is commonly said to have been unknown in Rome.

In the sense of (b) the Bidding Prayer is a feature of all liturgies, Eastern and Western. The Greek Ectene, the Roman Litany (in its last part), the solemn prayers of Good Friday, the prayers in the ancient Litany form at Milan on the Sundays of Lent, are all Bidding Prayers. (To my mind, it is quite a question whether the fourteenth and fifteenth century Bidding Prayer does not come historically from the Roman Litany rather than from anything else.)

2. The statement to which I have referred rests largely upon the ignoring of considerations of historical facts. The Bidding Prayer, like all other ecclesiastical institutions, has in the course of ages passed through a succession of different phases. Even parts of the Divine service which have not to us at the present day the appearance of belonging to the class of prayer commonly known as Bidding Prayer, are really representatives of it, and it is possible to put one's finger even on the very time, place, and persons concerned in the change. Who, for instance, unless the story were told would ever look upon the *Preces* of our modern Roman Breviary as a Bidding Prayer? And yet it is so.

In the Eastern Liturgies, the old form of Bidding Prayer is maintained, it is believed, practically unaltered from probably the fifth century. In the West, it has become a less prominent feature, not as the result specifically of Roman influence, but as the change from genuine Bidding Prayer to *preces* in the office shows, rather as the outcome of our character as Westerns.*

* This change took place in Gaul in the sixth century, and was adopted in the same century in Irish circles.

3. It may be of interest to state here the conclusion arrived at, on this point, by the well-known author of the "*Liber Pontificalis*," the Abbé Duchesne.

(1) He points out that the Kyrie of the Mass is a relic of the Bidding Prayer.

The Kyrie Eleison (of the Roman Mass) must be considered as the remains of the liturgical prayer or dialogue between one of the sacred ministers and the whole of the assisting assembly [*i.e.*, Bidding Prayer].

The Liturgy of Constantinople contains a Litany at the commencement of the Mass, before the entry of the celebrants. At Rome, it appears that this litany had anciently formed the opening part of the liturgy. It was the rule in the eighth century that on days of Litany (*i.e.*, the days on which there was a general procession from the Church of the Station) neither the *Kyrie* nor the *Gloria* was chanted at the Mass; and the service opened by the *Pax Vobiscum* and the Collect. In the same way, the Kyrie was omitted on days of Ordination, because the Litany was sung after the Gradual. Again, at the present day, the *Kyrie eleison* by which the Mass of Holy Saturday opens is nothing else than the conclusion of the litany which is sung at the commencement of this Mass.

St. Gregory testifies that in his time the words *Kyrie eleison*, *Christe eleison*, were, except in the daily Masses, accompanied by other formulas, doubtlessly a litany, more or less extended (Ep. ix. 12). "In quotidianis missis aliqua quae dici solent [*i.e.* at Solemn Mass] tacemus, tantummodo *Kyrie eleison* et *Christe eleison* dicimus, ut in his deprecationis vocibus paulo diutius occupemur."

This seems to imply that on solemn days there was just such a Bidding Prayer said in Rome as we now find at the beginning of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, the response being *Kyrie eleison*, *Christe eleison*.

(2) The Abbé Duchesne continues :

The Litany of the Saints now in use has handed down to us this ancient form* of the prayer in form of dialogue such as it was said in the Roman Church.† No doubt it has undergone many developments, especially in its first part, which contains the invocation of the saints.‡ But the end, the part in which the response is *Te rogamus audi nos*, has a character altogether ancient; it resembles much the litanic prayers used by the Greek Church.§ Although it is not evidenced by the texts of the eighth century,|| it is probable that it goes back to a much earlier date.

The suggestion here made, though not clearly, by the Abbé

* N.B. "form" not words.

† *i.e.*, in the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries.

‡ Unfortunately no one has given us a history of the Roman Litany, or examined the question as to when this invocation of the saints and the portion immediately following, to which the response is *Libera nos*, &c., were added to the primitive kernel. It is likely to have been in the seventh or eighth centuries.

§ Also in other Western rites. See Observations and Table at end.

|| We have no manuscripts giving the text at any date earlier than the eighth century.

Duchesne, at this point, is also that the Roman form of response in place of the Greek fashion *Kyrie eleison* was "*Te rogamus, &c.,*" and this suggestion is countenanced by the further consideration of the special way in which the *Kyrie eleison* is used in the Roman rite, viz.:

It is evident that the co-ordination of the *Kyrie eleison* with the litany did not take place at Rome in the same way as in the Eastern Churches. At Rome this invocation is placed at the beginning and at the end of the Litany.

In the East it is one of the two essential parts of the Litany—it is the people's response to the deacon's bid, like the *Te rogamus* of our Litany. In Rome, the *Kyrie* stands *outside* the Litany, as it were, like an adjunct. Moreover, in the Roman rite, the *Kyrie* is sung alternately by the cantors and the people.

St. Gregory already remarked this difference. Ep. ix. 12: *Kyrie eleison autem, nos neque diximus, neque dicimus** sicut a Graecis dicitur, quia in Graeciis [so in Duchesne] simul omnes dicunt; apud nos autem a clericis dicitur et a populo respondetur.

Now, what is the explanation of the *Kyrie* being outside the Roman Litany, so as to be, with us, in such a way as not to be a Bidding Prayer at all? For the deacon to say *Kyrie eleison* is no *bid*; for the people to say it after him is no response.

We find the explanation given by Duchesne to the following effect:

At Rome the *Kyrie eleison* is adventitious—that is to say, it is merely borrowed, and is no part of the Roman rite as developed in Rome—as it is indeed in all parts of the West. And the Roman imitation of the East in this particular of saying *Kyrie eleison* seems to have been the main determinant for other Churches to adopt it also—at least for those of Gaul, as appears by Canon 3 of the Council of Vaison in 529: "*Quia tam in sede Apostolica quam etiam per totas orientales atque Italiae provincias dulcis et nimium salutaris consuetudo est intromissa,*" it enacts that the *Kyrie eleison* be sung in the Churches of the Province of Arles, where it was not hitherto known. And accordingly, at the expiration of the Gallican Mass by Germanus at the close of the sixth century, we find the *Kyrie eleison* near the beginning of the Mass.

But the Roman bidding prayer had already its own termination. "They could not suppress the formula, '*Te rogamus audi nos,*' which plays in the Roman Litany the same part as the *Kyrie eleison* in the

* "*Diximus,*" i.e., it is not an old Roman practice; "*dicimus,*" i.e., nor have I made any alteration in this respect.

Greek Litany. It was necessary to find for the latter another place. A rather strange thing happened. The *Kyrie*, which was more modern at Rome than the Litany, kept its place in the service of the Mass, while the Litany, more ancient than it, was all but eliminated from it" (p. 158).

(3) Turning now to the Gallican Liturgy, we have already seen that the *Kyrie eleison* was introduced into Gaul in imitation of Rome in the sixth century. At Rome, this innovation, borrowed from the East, was brought into at least some relation with the Litany, the old Roman Bidding Prayer. In the Gallican rite, however, it was allowed to stand still more clearly as a mere *ajoute*, being put into the Mass much as we have the *Kyrie* there now. The *Kyrie* in Gaul is no part of the Gallican Bidding Prayer; for this we have to seek wholly elsewhere.

The Gallican rite had its bidding prayer (or at least this is the only one of which we can now discover any trace) immediately after the sermon (which itself followed the Gospel) and before the dismissal of the Catechumens.* The text, however, is not extant in any of the Gallican Missals. But the Stowe Missal preserves a text which was probably very much like the texts used in Gaul. Duchesne says it seems nothing but "a translation of a Greek text," but he qualifies this by adding that the "text does not correspond exactly with any of the known Greek Litanies, but it is divided in the same order and composed in the same style" (p. 191). For the Stowe text, see table given below.

(4) As for the Mozarabic, Duchesne says, "A prayer in the form of a litany, but composed for the use of public penitents, is to be found in the Mozarabic liturgy for the Sundays in Lent between the reading of the Prophets and the Epistle" (p. 189). The earliest MSS. date from the tenth century, though they doubtlessly represent correctly enough the practice of an earlier period. All that can be said is that the prayer in litany form mentioned here by Duchesne, may be a relic of a genuine Liturgical Bidding Prayer like that in the Stowe Missal, the (old) Roman Litany, the Constantinopolitan Ectene, &c. But the traces are only slight: Out of the ten or a dozen invocations, at most one or two do not refer to the penitents and are of a general cast. But the fact that these Litany-prayers are found in the *Sundays of Lent* is interesting for the following

* So also is its place in the "Liturgy of St. Chrysostom." In the Apostolic Constitutions it is after the dismissal of the Catechumens, &c. In the Liturgy of St. James all trace of dismissal of Catechumens has already disappeared, so we cannot say whether in that Liturgy the Bidding Prayer came before or after the Catechumens went.

reason. In the Ambrosian on Sundays of Lent there is at the beginning of the Mass a genuine Bidding Prayer quite of the old style (it is still in use). The earliest MS. extant is of the tenth century. I copy the text below in parallel columns with those of Stowe and the *To Rogamus* part of our actual Litany of the Saints. The reader thus may see the close connection of these Bidding Prayers, and be still able better to appreciate the precise value of the statement that the Bidding Prayer was unknown at Rome.

TABLE TO ILLUSTRATE THE FOREGOING.

(Responses are omitted as irrelevant to present purpose.)

STOWE MISSAL BIDDING PRAYER.	AMBROSIAN.	PRESENT ROMAN LITANY.
1. Pro altissima pace et tranquillitate temporum nostrorum, pro sancta Ecclesia Catholica, quæ a finibus usque ad terminos orbis terræ. (<i>Roman</i> 1)	1. Pro Ecclesia tua sancta Catholica quæ hic et per universum orbem diffusa est. (<i>Roman</i> 1.)	1. Ut Ecclesiam tuam sanctam regere et conservare digneris.
2. Pro pastore nostro episcopo, et omnibus episcopis et presbiteris et diaconis et omni clero. (<i>Rom.</i> 1.)	2. Pro Papa nostro M. et omni clero eius omnibusque sacerdotibus ac ministris. (<i>Rom.</i> 1.)	2. Ut Domnum Apostolicum et omnes ecclesiasticos ordines in sancta religione conservare digneris.
3. Pro hoc loco et habitantibus in eo. Pro piissimis Imperatoribus et omni Romano exercitu. (<i>Rom.</i> 4 & 6.)	3. Pro famulo tuo illo Imperatore . . . et omni exercitu eorum. (<i>Rom.</i> 4.)	3. No parallel.
4. Pro omnibus qui in sublimitate constituti sunt. Pro virginibus, viduis et orphanis.	4. Pro pace Ecclesiarum, vocatione gentium et quiete populorum. (<i>Rom.</i> 5.)	4. Ut regibus et principibus Christianis pacem et veram concordiam donare digneris.
5. Pro peregrinantibus, et iter agentibus ac navigantibus et pœnitentibus et Catechumenis.	5. Pro plebe hac et conversatione eius, omnibusque habitantibus in ea. (<i>Rom.</i> 6.)	5. Ut cuncto populo Christiano pacem et unitatem largiri digneris.
6. Pro his qui in Sancta Ecclesia fructus misericordiae largiuntur.	6. Pro aerum temperie ac fructum et fecunditate terrarum. (<i>Rom.</i> 10.)	6. Ut nosmetipsos in tuo sancto servitio confortare et conservare digneris.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>7. Sanctorum Apostolorum et Martyrum memores simus, ut orantibus eis pronobis veniam mereamur.</p> <p>8. Christianum et pacificum nobis finem concedi a Domino precemur. (<i>Cf. Rom. 6 & 5.</i>)</p> <p>9. Et Divinum in nobis permanere vinculum caritatis sanctum Dominum deprecemur.</p> <p>10. Conservare sanctitatem et Catholicam fidei puritatem Dominum deprecemur.</p> | <p>7. Pro virginibus, viduis et orphanis, captivis et poenitentibus.</p> <p>8. Pro navigantibus, iter agentibus, in carceribus et vinculis, in metallis, in exiliis constitutis.</p> <p>8. Pro his qui diversis infirmitatibus detinentur, quique spiritibus vexantur immundis.</p> <p>10. Pro his qui in sancta ecclesia fructus misericordiae largiuntur, exaudi nos, Deus, in omni oratione et deprecatione nostra.</p> | <p>7. No parallel.</p> <p>8. No parallel.</p> <p>9. No parallel.</p> <p>10. Ut fructus terrae dare et conservare digneris.</p> |
|---|--|--|
- Domine miserere. Kyrie eleison. Kyrie eleison. Kyrie eleison (apparently chanted by all).

EDMUND BISHOP.

Notes of Travel and Exploration.

Sir Gerald Portal on Uganda.—The volume of the late Commissioner to Uganda,* combined with his Parliamentary Report, give the latest and most authentic account of that country and the way thither. The number of its population has, he thinks, been much exaggerated, and he accepts Mgr. Hirth's calculation, based on carefully collected statistics, that its limits lie between 450,000 and half a million, as probably accurate. The main distinction of race is that between the Waganda, originally conquerors from the north, perhaps from Abyssinia, debased by intermarriage to a type morally and physically scarcely distinguishable from that of the negro, and the Wahuma, a pastoral people, who are tall and beautifully proportioned with brilliant teeth, velvety brown skin, and clear hazel eyes. The area of Uganda the author estimates at 15,000 to 16,000 square miles, approximately that of Switzerland, and it consists of a strip of land some sixty miles in width, enclosing Lake Victoria for a distance of perhaps 120 miles on its northern and 100 miles on its western shore. It is a region of flat-topped hills, from 300 to 600 feet high, separated by swamps, through which sluggish streams struggle along beds choked by dense growths of rushes, papyrus and other marsh vegetation. The hills are clothed with verdure to which frequent banana groves lend an aspect of tropical luxuriance, but these are in reality separated by tracts of elephant grass growing in a close tangle of cane-like stems some 15 or 16 feet high, forming a thicket impenetrable to anything between an elephant and a field-mouse. Lying directly under the Line, it has a very equable climate throughout the year, though from its height of 4000 feet above the sea, the diurnal range is considerable, and blankets are desirable at night, though the days are very hot. There is no regular rainy season, but scarcely a day passes without a thunderstorm. The subdivision of authority through numerous grades multiplies the number of oppressors of the unfortunate people, as each tyrant exacts a large percentage of the dues levied from them. The barbarous cruelties which accompanied their extortions have, however, been much mitigated by the influence of the missionaries of both parties.

* "The British Mission to Uganda in 1893." By Sir Gerald Portal. London: Edward Arnold. 1894.

The Route to Uganda.—The route from Mombasa to Uganda, followed by Sir Gerald Portal and his caravan, has the serious drawback as compared with that through the German territory, of passing through a much more barren region where the transport of food becomes a serious difficulty. The first of these barriers is the Taro Plain not very far from the coast, where a tract of thirty-seven miles without a drop of water has to be crossed by forced marches, winding up with a mountain ascent at the end. The second is near the end of the journey, and consists of a foodless and uninhabited region extending for 280 miles from Kikuyu to Kavirondo, necessitating the transport of a very large supply from the former country. Fortunately it is exceptionally fertile, and inhabited by a population, who, though treacherous and often hostile to travellers, are most industrious farmers, raising crops of sweet potatoes, corn, beans, and other produce, of far higher quality than those of their neighbours. They seem to love digging and delving for its own sake, as they grow far more produce than they can either consume or dispose of, so that they do not object to passing caravans helping themselves freely to a surplus, which otherwise would go to seed on the ground. On the other hand, by their mania for cultivation, they are rapidly deforesting the country, as they constantly take up fresh land for their crops. This part of Africa, lying from 4000 to 7000 feet above the sea, is eminently suited to white settlement, and grows the fruits and vegetables of temperate and tropical regions with impartial luxuriance. It is separated from the central plateau by what geographers term the great meridional rift, a volcanic depression running nearly north and south and occupied by a chain of lakes. Its western rampart is formed by the Mau Mountains, on which, at the height of nearly 9000 feet, the temperature at night falls below freezing, causing much suffering and generally some fatal cases of illness from exposure among the insufficiently clad native porters. The watershed of the Nile is here crossed, and after a descent partly through dense forest, the exuberant rolling downs that border the Victoria Nyanza are reached in Kavirondo on its north-eastern shore. From this land of plenty, which the writer opines may one day become the granary of far-distant regions, the march lay through Usoga, described as “a land of fine trees, of endless banana gardens, of cool shade and intelligent-looking, chocolate-coloured people, completely clothed from head to foot in graceful togas of bark-cloth.” Here the caravan was supplied with all descriptions of food with the most lavish generosity, bananas being brought in vast bunches in the green unripe stage at which they are cooked as a vegetable. The Nile forms the boundary of this hospitable

country, and when it is crossed near the Ripon Falls, Uganda is entered.

Transport in East Africa.—Sir Gerald Portal points out that the first step towards making Central Africa accessible must be the substitution of animal transport for that by carriers, and believes that there is no insuperable difficulty in doing this. The two ponies taken with the expedition were in perfect health the entire way, and though the coast is unhealthy for horses and mules there is no evidence that the interior is so. Camels, too, have never had a fair trial, as they have been managed by drivers ignorant of their wants, and the donkeys commonly used are overloaded and underfed. The zebra, the horse of the country, Captain Lugard believes capable of domestication, adducing the instance of the team stated to have been broken in to draw a coach at Johannesburg. The present system leads to great hardship and cruelty, in the abandonment of disabled porters by the way, and in the want of provision both for illness and for their clothing in crossing the Mau Mountains. To obviate these evils a system of registration is urgently required, as well as regulations rendering compulsory the supply of a certain amount of extra clothing, the provision of some spare carriers to relieve the sick, arrangements prescribed by ordinary humanity. The carrying power of some of the porters is prodigious, and the author gives an interesting account of an ivory caravan encountered in Kikuyu, on its way to the coast with 15,000 lbs. of ivory. The owner had a parade of his "strong men" for him, at which "some twenty grand specimens of black humanity came forward, each seized a tusk of over 80 lbs. in weight, with a Hercules at their head carrying the gigantic one of 140 lbs. As though they had feathers on their shoulders, these men fell into line, and then actually proceeded to dance under a weight that would deprive most average Englishmen of the power of motion. Round and round in a large circle they danced, singing a weird monotonous chant, from time to time, on a signal from their leader, swinging the great ivories from one shoulder to the other, the muscles standing out on their necks and backs in great solid lumps glistening in the sun." For five or six hours a day, week after week, they would have to carry these crushing weights through swamp and morass for the long march of 800 miles from Uganda to the coast. Sir Gerald's return route was by the Tana River, with a view to exploring its possibilities in facilitating the journey, but the grand stream runs through trackless jungle, and its navigation is impeded by cataracts and rapids.

Explorations in Kafiristan.—Dr. Robertson, at the evening meeting of the Royal Geographical Society on June 25th, described his unique experiences as an English traveller in Kafiristan. Those little-known uplands lying amid the southern buttresses of the western Hindu Khush, have till now been barely grazed by exploration, and no foreigner had previously penetrated their inner folds, or come into close contact with the life of their jealously exclusive inhabitants. Their name Kafirs, implies, that though now professing the faith of Islam, they were original infidels among a Mohammedan population, and tradition ascribes their origin to a colony of the soldiers of Alexander the Great. Their principal pursuit is raiding caravans near their borders, on which they make organised attacks, returning in triumph with the pillage if successful. They celebrate their victory in a prolonged series of dances in honour of the war-god, the principal object of their worship, exulting in the loss inflicted on the enemy, and in their own prowess. Although extremely quarrelsome among themselves, the killing of one member of the community by another is visited with the severest penalties, probably on account of the loss of fighting strength thereby inflicted on the tribe. The slayer is driven away from his home into life-long exile, while his house is burnt and his property laid waste. Hence bystanders, men, women, and even children will recklessly expose their own lives by throwing themselves between a pair of combatants in order to avert bloodshed. They are polygamists, and the process of courtship consists entirely in the payment of a certain number of cows for the bride, who remains in her father's custody until the full amount of the claim has been satisfied. All agricultural labour is performed by the women, and one of the interesting drawings with which the lecture was illustrated, represented a woman guiding the plough drawn by a diminutive ox. The vegetation in the valleys is luxuriant, wild grapes and pomegranates flourishing exuberantly, while splendid shade trees, horse-chestnuts in particular, clothe the mountain slopes. The main valleys from which subsidiary glens and ravines rise steeply to the higher levels are cut off from all intercommunication during the winter months, and are at other times accessible only by tracks so rough that they seem adapted for goats or chamois rather than for human beings.

The English Polar Expedition.—Mr. Jackson, on the eve of his start for the polar regions, addressed the Royal Geographical Society on Monday evening, June 25th, and his ship and stores were subsequently inspected by visitors in Shadwell Basin. The

"Windward," a Peterhead whaler, a barque rigged screw-steamer of 400 tons measurement, is to convey the adventurous party of eight to their base on the southern coast of Franz Josef Land, which they hoped to reach on August 23rd. There the "Windward" will leave them, to return in search of them in the summer of 1896. They expect to be able to advance in successive stages some 600 or 700 miles inland, establishing a line of depôts each more remote than the other. Their means of locomotion are provided by eighteen sledges combining great lightness with strength, and each capable of carrying 1000 lbs. weight. An aluminium boat weighing only 150 lbs., but capable of carrying from thirteen to twenty people, and constructed with great ingenuity, forms part of the equipment, as do a copper boat built on the same lines and weighing 198 lbs. and three Norwegian boats which can also be used as sledges. Siberian ponies will be taken, and a pack of dogs will be ready for the expedition at Archangel. The supply of provisions is sufficient to last four years on full rations, or seven years on half rations. In addition to these resources, rifles, shot guns, harpoons and fishing tackle are expected to furnish fresh meat from the abundance of game with which Mr. Leigh Smith described Franz Josef Land as swarming. Mr. Jackson's seven companions are all tried men, possessed of special qualifications for the various classes of work they have undertaken. The expedition sailed on July 12th, and expected to reach Archangel in seventeen days.

The Wellman Expedition.—The only news received of this party of American Arctic explorers gives rise to apprehensions of a disaster. The "Saide" of the Royal Yacht Squadron, touched on July 6th at Danes Island, near Spitzbergen, and found there Mr. Oyen, the geologist, left by Mr. Wellman in charge of the depôt with a single dog as companion. The main party of fifteen, with a crew of nine, had sailed on May 7th in their ship, the "Ragnvald Jarl," for the Seven Islands, promising to return and pick him up in about ten days. Since then nothing has been heard or seen of them, and the Norwegian walrus-hunters are of opinion that the ship has been beset and crushed. The Saide skirted the pack to beyond the 80th parallel, but was there met by heavy ice. Captain Johannesen of the walrus fleet will proceed in search of them as soon as the ice permits, and will in any case bring away Mr. Oyen.

Count Pfeil on New Mecklenburgh. — Petermann's "Mittheilungen" contains an interesting account of a visit to the long and low island in the South Pacific, some hundreds of miles north-east of New Guinea, known as New Ireland until it passed under German rule. Count Pfeil, one of the few Europeans who has visited this addition to the Vaterland, disembarked on the western shore, and surmounting the central ridge, from which the sea is visible on both sides, descended to the eastern shore, crossing on his way a level tract of bush traversed by a considerable stream. Thence following the shore northwards, he spent some time in a village inhabited by friendly natives. Exploration southward was stopped by a quarrel with the natives, in which two of the traveller's followers were killed. The island is well wooded, and the climate is moist, as the upper slopes of the hills were generally mist-covered. The inhabitants of the centre are invaders, who have driven the original population to the north and south. They represent a higher degree of social advancement, and build neat houses though they wear no clothing. They believe in an invisible god and goddess, the progenitors of mankind, and hold communication with them through their priests. The dead are either burned, or sunk in the sea with a stone at their feet and a bush in their hands, and their souls are supposed to inhabit an adjacent island. These islanders are cannibals, and their women prepare the revolting repast, but are only allowed to partake of it by licking their fingers. They carry on active trading operations, and make voyages, some in hollow trees with an outrigger, some on rafts made of planks lashed together. Their currency is composed of mussel-shells, red, black and white, each colour separately strung, and representing a separate value. The sale of pigs, their only domestic animals, is conducted in a special coin in the form of a disc. The giant *Tridacna* is used for food, the shell when it gapes being prevented from closing by the insertion of a stone or stick, and the inhabitant being then at their mercy. Yams and taros are cultivated, and the pith of the sago palm extracted and prepared. Vegetation is most abundant, rich verdure prevailing everywhere, with mosses, ferns and orchids in profuse variety. Cockatoos and parrots are absent, but the Torres Strait pigeon abounds, as do different kinds of beetles, while butterflies are scarce.

A Recent Visit to Harrar.—A correspondent writing in the *Times* of July 10th, who visited Harrar in 1892, claims to have been the first Englishman to enter it since the Egyptian evacuation in

1881. Its original annexation by Ismail Pasha was effected on the pretext that it was to be used temporarily as a base of operations against Abyssinia, but Egyptian rule once established was made permanent and was justified by the improved prosperity of the place. Its trade was developed and the cultivation of coffee was extensively practised by the "fellahin" who settled there, but all this progress came to an end with the withdrawal of the Egyptian garrison, accompanied by the bulk of the inhabitants. The English having refused to take it over, a member of the former native dynasty, of Arab-Galla extraction, was placed on the throne, to be expelled seven years later, when Menelek, King of Shoa, the present Negus of Abyssinia, marched on it and occupied it without resistance. Its prosperity has since waned as its trade has declined, and the coffee plantations have been cut down for firewood, or left to be overrun by weeds. Under Italian rule it ought again to become a valuable possession, as it has great natural capabilities, and its situation, 7000 feet above the sea, on the spur of the highlands at the back of Somaliland, renders the climate healthy and the heat bearable, although it is within a few degrees of the Equator. The district surrounding it is of exceptional fertility, the coffee and tobacco in particular being of prime quality; the water supply is abundant, and is renewed by a double rainy season in spring and autumn, when a series of heavy thunder showers with bright intervals refresh the vegetation. The nearest port is Zeilah, one of the three in northern Somaliland under British protection. The route thence of about 186 miles, runs for 150 across the plains, the remaining 56 being a steep mountain climb. The early part of the journey offers few features of interest, as the path crosses tracts of sand interspersed with tufts of grass or thorny scrub. The river beds are wide depressions with a selva of forest, and are dry except after the rains, although water is found in them by digging. Jildessa, at the foot of the ascent, is the first spot of permanent habitation reached, and here the scene changes. Running water abounds, towering forests take the place of sand and bush, and the Galla mountains rise to a great height above the plain. The road ascends through forests in which sycamore trees, acacias, and euphorbias are conspicuous, while coffee plantations occupy clearings in the jungle where the hill side is terraced in ledges. At 8200 ft. the mountain rampart is scaled, and the plateau plain is seen spreading far away with a slope to the south. A fine specimen of the table mountain, a formation characteristic of the Abyssinian plateau, is seen among the peaks which bound the expanse. The plain is thickly inhabited, and either cultivated or used for pasture, the forest having disappeared. Harrar is

seen about twelve miles from its edge, "a great yellow town crowned by a whitewashed circular Abyssinian church, built on the site of the old mosque, the minaret of which still remains, for until the advent of the Abyssinians, the Harrar people were one and all Moslems." Its rough stone walls are surrounded by terraced gardens, but the city proper has little of interest except the market held in its principal street attended by specimens of all the native tribes with the varieties of strange hair dressing peculiar to the Gallas.

State of the Soudan.—The capture of Kassala by the Italians on July 17th, deprives the Dervishes of their chief stronghold in the Eastern Soudan. News brought by a caravan from the interior which reached Keren *viâ* Kassala about the same time, show that the Khalifa's position was considered very precarious, and that he himself, like all tyrants, was rendered additionally cruel by suspicion. He had increased his bodyguard, and imposed fresh taxes in order to meet the additional expense of their pay and rations, and had imprisoned and confiscated the property of the Kadi Ahmed, the chief religious authority of Omdurman, on the plea of doubting his allegiance. He was also preparing to reduce the number of horsemen under the Emir Ali, the strongest cavalry corps in the army, doubtless from jealousy of his influence. He had summoned a grand council of chiefs to meet at Omdurman, but little alacrity was shown by them in responding to it; in fact the Emirs of Kassala and Berber, as well as Osman Digna, were very reluctant to go to Khartoum, fearing some mischance.

Notices of Books.

Pilate's Wife. By RICHARD T. HAYWARDEN. London: Burns & Oates.

THE author of this graceful sketch fills up from imagination some of the details of that unseen figure whose shadow falls for a moment across the page of the Evangelist in the narrative of the great tragedy of the world's redemption. We follow with interest any attempt to call up for us the heroine of what we may call the romantic episode of the intervention of Pilate's wife in the trial in the Pretorium. A great Roman lady, who played the part of a vice-queen in Judea, she evidently enjoyed a wife's full privileges, from the confidence with which she addresses a remonstrance to her husband on the discharge of the most momentous functions of his office. Yet this pampered, petted creature, as we imagine her to ourselves, had a spiritual insight denied to most pagans of her time, and could not shut out in her silken chamber the consciousness of the iniquity being wrought under her roof. She may have had some previous knowledge of the mission and teaching of the Nazarene on whose behalf she interceded so vainly; and we would fain hope that, as represented in the pages before us, this movement of feminine compassion was rewarded by conversion to the doctrines He had preached.

Barabbas. By MARIE CORELLI. 8vo, pp. 465. London: Methuen & Co. 1894.

WE must confess to having opened this book with a shudder, fearing to find the dread and sacred tragedy of Calvary travestied by being made the framework of an ordinary novel. But the tender reverence of the treatment and the imaginative beauty of the writing have reconciled us to the daring of the conception, and the conviction is forced on us that even so exalted a subject cannot be made too familiar to us, provided it be presented in the true spirit of Christian faith. This is here the case as regards the main subject, and the only notable deviation from the Gospel narrative is in the interpretation put on the character and motives of Judas Iscariot.

His treachery is ascribed to the wish, not to destroy his Master, but to force His hand, by compelling Him to proclaim Himself by visible miracle, thus hastening the triumph of His cause. To this view he is brought by the influence of his beautiful sister, Judith, the tool of Caiaphas, and evil genius of all who fall under her spell. Among these is Barabbas, a wild and fierce-hearted but not ignoble creature, made the allegorical type of fallen humanity, requiring the chastisement of suffering to awaken it to spiritual truth. Dragged from his cell, ignorant of the fate in store for him, to find himself acclaimed by the mob as their chosen one, he protests against a decision which absolves his guilt in order to condemn the Divine Innocence. A witness of the scenes that follow, he is rewarded by gradual perception of the truth, as earthly passion drops away from him and leaves him to die purified and penitent.

The beauty of the narrative culminates in the description of the Resurrection in a passage of sublime eloquence. The scene at the Sepulchre is realised with extraordinary vividness, and we are made to see the Roman soldiers encamped before it and the military pageantry of the relief of the guard amid the comments of the rude Centurion on the strange task assigned to him. These realistic details form, by contrast, a fitting prelude to the portents which herald the great Event—the singing of a miraculous choir of birds and flowering of the brown earth into a carpet of snowy blossom. Then come the terrific splendours of the illumination of the heavens and descent of the angelic messengers, as “seemingly impelled by wind and fire, they floated meteor-like through space,” and reached the earth, which rocked beneath their touch.

The only jarring note in the narrative is the hostility with which St. Peter is spoken of, but it is rather implied than expressed, and we gladly pass it over amid so much that evokes our admiration. Our Lady is only introduced in two passages of great tenderness, and the utterances of Mary Magdalene are full of beauty and feeling. The amplifications of the Scripture narrative are often conceived with high poetic insight, as in the luminous halo seen by Pilate and Barabbas round the head of the condemned Nazarene, and in the ecstasy felt by the Cyrenean in carrying the Cross. This “*Dream of the World’s Tragedy*,” as it is entitled, is, despite some trifling incongruities, a lofty and not inadequate paraphrase of the supreme climax of inspired narrative.

While the writer does not contend for any continuity of consciousness to connect these different states of being, she adopts the Buddhist belief that the conduct and character of the individual in each is predetermined by the “*karma*,” or sum of moral merit or demerit

acquired during its previous existence. Of course there is no possibility of arguing against such a belief, but we would merely point out what the writer seems to be unaware of—that it is contrary to the whole teaching of Christianity, and subversive of the idea of personal responsibility on which its ethical system depends.

La France Noire. Par MARCEL MONNIER. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1894.

THIS interesting volume is a valuable addition to our rapidly increasing knowledge of countries destined before long to take their place in the great scheme of international polity. Written with the epigrammatic brilliancy which lends so much point to French narrative, it tells the story of the expedition, led by Captain Binger in 1892, to lay down, in combination with an English Commission, the boundary between the French possessions on the Ivory Coast and the British protectorate of the Gold Coast, including the former kingdom of Ashanti. The country in dispute is more prized for its prospective than for its actual value, as it is buried beneath trackless forest, and has but a sparse and apathetic population. The first eighty-four days were passed under dense shade, in an atmosphere poisoned by swampy exhalations and by the pestiferous odour of animal and vegetable decomposition. The more invigorating plateau country then reached has a more energetic population under Mussulman rule, and offering greater possibilities for trade. Gold dust, found in considerable quantities in the ravines, is the principal currency, necessitating its valuation by weight as a preliminary to all payments. Such is the productiveness of the soil in some places that a hectare of bananas yields on an average 200,000 kilogrammes of fruit, and half the crop is left to decay on the trees. The people are so credulous that they believed a successful elephant-hunter to have the power of transforming himself at will into a bush, flower, or bird in order to escape the rage of the wounded animal. As he was hump-backed and hideously ugly, the travellers asked why he did not use his powers of metamorphosis to improve his appearance, a query to which no reply was forthcoming. In the plateau country some of the towns numbered three or four thousand inhabitants, but here the nauseating accumulation of dirt was, if possible, worse than in the forest villages. In the manners of the people there was little to interest, apathy and degradation levelling all distinctions of character or race.

Vom Nil Zum Nebo. Ein Wüstensang von Karl Macke.
Heiligenstadt: F. W. Cordier. 1894.

THE hero of this magnificent poem is Moses, the deliverer, law-giver, and guide of Israel, who leads the chosen people from the Nile through the desert to the frontier of Canaan. He saw the promised land from the top of Mount Nebo over against Jericho, and died without being allowed to enter it. The author describes the chief events of the history of Moses and the children of Israel at his time substantially according to Scripture in twenty songs. The history itself is full of types of Christ, the Church, and the Sacraments, and offers very many analogies to the history of man, his sorrows and trials and divine helps during his pilgrimage through the desert of this life to the promised land of heaven. The author makes frequent use of these types and allegories, and has thus given us a Biblical epos with many lyrical and didactic parts. He evidently knows the Orient and oriental life and literature very well, as is seen in many vivid, and sometimes very grand, descriptions and comparisons, and in all the details.

The Biblical account is often enlarged upon—*e.g.*, with regard to the daughter of Pharaoh, Thermatis, who saved the child Moses and educated him. She meets Moses again after his return to Egypt, and tries in vain to persuade Pharaoh to let the Israelites go out of Egypt. As she professes faith in the true God of Israel, she is banished and cursed by Pharaoh. The eighth song, in which she is the chief figure, recalls all the symbols and doctrines of the Egyptians regarding the future life, and explains them in a Christian sense. In our opinion, this song is a most beautiful one. Even more beautiful still is the tenth song, about the manna and the Blessed Eucharist. The author makes use of an old legend, according to which Paradise still exists in the East on a mountain which cannot be approached by the feet of man. From this mountain God sent to the Israelites the wonderful manna, blown off from the trees of Paradise, and carried away to the desert like snow by the winds. In a similar manner divine grace sends us our manna, the Blessed Eucharist, out of the heavenly Paradise.

The whole is written throughout in trochaic verses. There are four verses to a strophe, and the second and fourth verse rhyme with each other. Great beauty of language and smoothness of verse and rhyme is here combined, with a rare power of poetical description, and an equally rare wealth of thoughts of a refined and thoroughly Catholic, manly, and poetical mind. Dr. Macke's work deserves for its content as well as its form the highest praise. We may add that

the publisher, Cordier in Heiligenstadt, has done his part in a highly artistic manner.

The Ban of Maplethorpe. By E. H. DERING. London and Leamington : Art and Book Company. 1894.

THIS prettily illustrated tale is likely to be useful as well as entertaining to many readers, as it enforces the foundations of Catholic truth in the controversial discussion carried on between the various characters. It is enlivened by vivid descriptions of country life, and ornamented by some charming illustrations. A touching interest attaches to its publication from the announcement prefixed to it that it was completed only the evening before the death of the author, for whom the prayers of the reader are requested.

Europa's Moods. By A. PITTIE. London : Simpkin & Marshall. 1894.

THIS volume contrasts, in the two cantos into which it is divided, the mirthful mood of our Continental neighbours as seen in the Battle of Flowers at Nice, with the serious aspects of European politics in the threat to the peace of the world implied in the Franco-Russian alliance. The author's somewhat trite musings on these subjects are versified in fairly fluent doggerel.

Mediæval Records and Sonnets. By AUBREY DE VERE. London : Macmillan. 1893.

THE congenial themes of mediæval piety and heroism could not fail to inspire Mr. de Vere's muse, and this volume is worthy to stand side by side with his "May Lyrics." The "Legends of the Cid" are narrated in eloquent blank verse, as is the later epic of the Maid of Orleans. Hildebrand, St. Francis, Columbus and Copernicus, have each a place in this gallery of poetical types of the Middle Ages, and to the character of each fitting expression has been given. Columbus at Seville in particular is a striking picture of the musings of the dying and disgraced hero. The volume also contains a collection of beautiful sonnets, two of them addressed to Father Damien.

Sherborne. By E. H. DERING. London and Leamington: Art and Book Company. 1894.

THE principal interest of this spirited controversial novel is a religious one, turning on the mental struggles of those who while internally convinced of the truth of Catholicism, are deterred by worldly motives from joining the Church. To the large number of those in a similar painful position, this powerful picture of its dangers and difficulties should be useful. The author is evidently quite at home in fashionable country-house life, and is especially happy in his animated descriptions of horses.

Kirchen-Lexicon von Wetzer und Welte. Neue Auflage. Begonnen von Cardinal HERGENROETHER, fortgesetzt von Professor KAULEN. Achter Band. Freiburg: Herder. 1894. 8vo. 2118 col.

VOLUME the seventh of this great undertaking has been duly noticed in October issue of the DUBLIN REVIEW 1892. To-day we are able to announce the appearance of volume the eighth comprising the articles extending from *Literæ apostolicæ* to *Mythologie*. Both as regards the names of the learned contributors, the vastness of erudition stored up in every department of theology, the public will not fail to recognise that the present volume merits the high praise of being not inferior to its predecessors. In the science of philosophy we may mention Professor von Hertling's (Munich University) able article on John Locke. It is perhaps to this article that we are indebted for the Professor's recent book (Freiburg: Herder, 1893) on "John Locke and the School of Cambridge." Whoever is familiar with the writings of Locke is aware of the empiricism which pervades his whole system. But the latter likewise exhibits a strong feature of intellectualism, the cause of which is to be traced to the influence exercised upon Locke by the Platonic School of Cambridge. To Professor Stöckl of Eichstätt, Bavaria, we owe the articles on Malebranche, Mensch, Mysticismus, and Stuart Mill. The learned author has given a lucid exposition of Mill's system and the fatal defects inherent in it. F. Gruber, S.J., contributes the pithy article on Materialism, whilst Professor Hagemann (Academy of Münster), in treating on "Materie und Form," seems to display excessive eagerness in emphasising the difficulties commonly brought up against the scholastic system. A thoughtful and suggestive article on "Mystic," comes from the pen of Provost Pruner of Eichstätt. Proceeding to the department of dogmatic

theology, the most remarkable articles are those of Professor Atzberger (Munich University) on the "Logos" and the "Missio s. Spiritus." The most lengthy article of the whole volume appears to be Professor Schanz's contribution on "The Messias." It would be difficult to overrate its value both on account of its classical learning and of its tone of deep Catholic piety. In no way second to it are Professor Kaulin's articles on "Maria, Mutter Gottes," and "Maria im Neuen Testament." Both of them are well worthy of the close attention of theologians and preachers. The article on "Molina," by Canon Morgott, commends itself for its thoroughness to students in dogmatic theology and church history. The same writer in another article has shed fresh light on a learned Scotchman, John Mayor, who taught scholastic theology in Paris at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The articles on the domain of ecclesiastical history are of the highest importance. Professor Kihn (Würzburg University) writes upon "Theologische Literatur-Geschichte." The articles on Popes Marcellinus and Miltiades are written by P. Grisar, S.J., who for many years has devoted his studies in Rome to research in the history of the first centuries of Christianity. The important bishoprics have been given due prominence. From amongst articles upon celebrated authors we single out those on "Mabillon," by F. Bäumer, "Angelo Mai," by Cardinal Hergenrother, and "Monta," by several eminent Roman doctors of canon law, amongst whom Pietro de Accoltis, Cardinal and Bishop of Ancona, seems deserving of special mention. As might be duly expected from Charles V., he is deeply concerned about the position of his Aunt Catherine of Aragon. Dr. Ehses is to be congratulated on his successful researches in the Vatican which have led to the discovery of a number of letters written in Spanish by the Emperor to Clement VII., and which reflect favourably on Charles's character. Contrasted with the coarse language adopted by Henry VIII. in his correspondence with Rome when the result of the process became all but certain, the Emperor's language is cool, dispassionate, and expressive of his firm conviction of the justice of Catherine's cause. For the first time we elicit the fact that Henry VIII. even applied to the famous Pietro Caraffa, Bishop of Chieti (afterwards Paul IV.) for an opinion favourable to his process of divorce. The bishop received the king's agent but disapproved of his divorce, and maintained the marriage with Catherine as lawful. The Emperor, upon being made acquainted with these facts, in a letter dated "Ispruch," May 22, 1530 (p. 269), congratulated the bishop, whose answer to Charles V. is likewise inserted (p. 270).

Dr. Ehses's book may be hailed as one of the most important
 [No 12 of *Fourth Series*.] 2 H

corroborations and vindications of the action of Pope Clement VII. in the momentous case of King Henry's petition for divorce.

A. BELLESHEIM.

Römische Documente zur Geschichte der Ehescheidung Heinrichs VIII. von England 1527—1534. Mit Erläuterungen herausgeben von DR. STEPHAN EHSES. Paderborn: Schoeningh. 1893. S°. xliv. 284 pages.

DR. EHSES, secretary to the historical institute established by the Goerres-Gesellschaft in Rome, presents us with a collection of Roman documents bearing on the divorce of Henry VIII. The number of these amounts to not less than 147. To them are added twenty-two extracts from the correspondence of Giovanni Salviati, Papal legate to the court of France, which for the most part refer to the politics of Wolsey. It is to be remarked that although several of the documents contained in the above collection have been published before, the book, taken as a whole, is possessed of considerable importance. If Theiner's "*Monumenta vetera*," and the contributions to the history of Henry VIII. by Pocock, Brewer, and Gairdner are to be rightly understood by the student of history, they will require to be supplemented or duly corrected by Dr. Ehse's collection. Owing to his familiarity with the Vatican Archives he has succeeded in deciphering the letters of Cardinal Campeggio who resided in England from October 1528 to October 1529 as Papal judge in the divorce process of Henry VIII. The effect is that a large number of documents is now for the first time printed in a full and correct text. We may instance the letter written by Cardinal Campeggio to Jacobo Salviati in Rome from London October 26, 1529. Comparing Theiner's text, pp. 570—574, in the *Monum. Vetera Hibern. et Scotor* with the original deciphered by Ehse, p. 55, the reader suddenly becomes aware that it lacks one of the most important pieces of information ever sent by Campeggio to Rome. It refers to the famous "*bolla de la decretale*" which the Cardinal read before the King and Cardinal Wolsey, but utterly refused to give it out of his hand. Afterwards, by the Pope's command, he destroyed the bull the purport of which had been totally mistaken by Wolsey. Pocock and Brewer are corrected, pages 16, 32, 72, 110, and Mr. Gairdner page 37. The accurate deciphering of Campeggio's letter January 9, 1529, calls for several corrections in the text of Brewer, "*The Reign of Henry VIII.*" vol. ii. p. 480. But besides the critical standpoint and

the copious historical notes attached to each document, we wish to call attention to the editor's introduction as shedding a new light on the bull and the brief by which Julius II., December 26, 1503, granted dispensation to Prince Henry for contracting marriage with his sister-in-law, Princess Catherine of Aragon. The events from which originated the brief are duly considered, its genuineness is placed beyond any doubt, and the fact is fully established that both documents are in perfect harmony. To documents Nos. 19 and 20 a singularly high value is attached, as they contain some deliberations held in the presence of Clement VII. concerning the King's process against his wife. In perusing Campeggio's despatches from London one is struck by two facts. First comes the Queen's unalterable firmness in vindicating her position as Queen of England and legitimate wife of Henry VIII., in declining Campeggio's counsel to retire to a convent, and in appealing to the Holy See for deciding the process in Rome. On the other hand Campeggio is seen as incessantly urged by the King to give his sentence with the least possible delay. One of the most remarkable expressions of the Legate on this point is deciphered by Dr. Ehse, p. 110, but is lacking in Theiner's "*Monumenta*," p. 587. An excellent and impartial survey of the transactions in the process is furnished in a papal document, p. 150. Next we may point out the extracts taken from Consistorial acts and the opinions on the petition of King Henry presented to the Pope by Montalembert, by F. Brumgartner, S.J. Amongst the articles which deal with English history, F. Zimmermann, Ditton Hall, has written articles on "*St. Malachias O'Morgair*," "*Lollarden*," "*London*," "*Queen Mary*," and "*Methodisten*." The writer has contributed the articles on "*Peter Lombard*," "*Archbishop of Armagh*," "*Cardinal Manning*," "*Mary Queen of Scots*," and "*Milton*." It is to be regretted that the writer of the otherwise able article on "*Blessed Thomas More*" has not taken note of F. Bridgett's scholarly life of the great Chancellor. The whole of this compendious work testifies to the unwearied zeal and erudition of its authors and editors.

A. BELLESHEIM.

Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss. Seine Geschichte und sein Inhalt. Von SUITBERT BAUMER. Mainz: Kirchheim. 1893. 8vo, viii-240 pages.

ENGLISH Catholics will be already sufficiently acquainted with the fierce controversies which for two years have been carried on amongst German Protestants concerning the Apostles' Creed.

Clergymen, professors of Protestant theology, eminent laymen, have been united in an effort to bring about either its elimination from the solemn liturgy, or the suppression of at least such of its parts as seem to be out of harmony with the development of modern theology. The chief leader in this contest appears to be Adolf Harnack, the well-known Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. What he mainly objects to is the article: Born of the Virgin Mary. His pamphlet on the Apostles' Creed was brought out in twenty-two editions, a fact which in itself is sufficient proof that his antichristian ideas can boast of a large and sympathetic following in Germany. In order to check Professor Harnack's opposition to the Creed, the supreme authority of the Protestant Church in Prussia (Oberkirchenrath) has addressed a circular to the superintendents urging upon them the duty of safeguarding the Creed, but without attributing to each of its articles the importance of a rigid law of teaching. Although these sad disputes amongst German Protestants do not immediately concern the Catholic Church, we could not help wishing that a Catholic divine might come forward as a champion of one of the most venerable symbols of early Christianity. F. Bäumer, Benedictine monk of Beuron, by his excellent work recalls the best traditions of the time-honoured Benedictines of France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Whether we consider his comprehensive acquaintance with Christian antiquity, or the critical acumen displayed in sifting the arguments proposed by his adversaries, it is a matter of congratulation that in so comparatively brief a space of time he should have succeeded in collecting so vast an amount of materials referring to the Apostles' Creed. English works, both Catholic and Protestant, have been largely laid under contribution. We regret that Father Livius's book, "Mary in the Epistles," apparently has escaped his attention, for he might have suitably employed it (p. 197) in the exposition of the third article of the Creed. After having established the difference between rule of faith, the canon of liturgy, and solemn prayer and symbol or creed, F. Bäumer goes on to inquire into the tradition of the various texts of the Creed. From his minute investigation the fact becomes evident that in A.D. 500 the actual modern form of the Apostles' Creed was employed throughout the Western Church, not excepting the Church of Rome. For F. Baumer has successfully established the fact that, notwithstanding the Sacramentarium Gelasianum with its creed of Nicæa and Constantinople, the Roman Church from Gelasius down to Charlemagne has constantly used the Apostles' Creed. One of the most convincing proofs of this is found in the action of an Englishman. F. Bäumer refers to the Codex S. Bonifacii, Fulda, containing not a few

“*Expositiones symboli Apostolorum et regulæ fidei.*” The most important part of this suggestive book begins in the fifth chapter, where the author treats upon the form of the Creed as appearing in each century from St. Leo I. back to the time of the Apostles. In the concluding fourteenth chapter he deals with the sources or origins of the Apostles’ Creed in the writings of St. Peter and St. Paul.

Aristoteles-Lexikon. Von Dr. MATTHIAS KAPPES. 8vo, 70 pp. Paderborn: Schöningh. 1894.

“**N**ULLUM fere erst nomen a philosophis frequentatum, quin ad Aristotelem redeat,” says the late Professor Trendelenburg, one of those scholars who have successfully laboured for re-establishing the immortal philosopher of Stagira. Dr. Kappes, in this pamphlet, affords the principal termini technici of Aristotle alphabetically arranged and largely illustrated by quotations from his several works. Notwithstanding its small compass, it represents a profound research into Aristotelian philosophy. The scholastics who have drawn so largely on Aristotle are not left unmentioned, for this may be seen by a reference to the terms *δύναμις*, *ἐνέργεια*, and others where due notice is taken of the historical development which the terms have undergone in the course of ages.

Problems of the Far East: Japan, Korea, China. By the Hon. G. N. CURZON, M.P. London: Longmans & Co. 1894.

THE author, with whom travel has been adopted as a course of training for statesmanship, has produced a book whose opportuneness to the present crisis is the least of its merits. With that power of assimilating encyclopedic information of which his monumental work on Persia was an example, he looks beneath the superficial aspect of things to lay bare the inner springs of national existence. Thus he ascribes the recent invasion of Korea by Japan, skilfully prepared, as it was, for months previous, to the desire of the statesmen of the latter country to avert domestic revolution by foreign adventure. Of the ultimate future of China he is not sanguine, maintaining that her tardy progress is “a mechanical and not a moral advance, an artificial and not an organic reform.” His chapters on Korea, where few travellers have penetrated, are novel and entertaining. A king who with his courtiers sits up at night for fear of ghosts, and accounts the electric light among methods of exorcism,

is a suggestive study of barbaric superstition, face to face with the results of modern progress. The Palace electrician is consequently in a superior position, as the only official whose salary is regularly paid, since when it falls into arrears his machinery by some mysterious effect of sympathy invariably gets out of order. With this potentate, described as "an old gentleman with a faultless black hat, a benign and sleepy expression, plump cheeks, and a long, thin, grey moustache and beard," he had an amusing interview. Having been warned that he would lose all consideration in his Majesty's eyes if he confessed to his real age as only thirty-three, he boldly answered when questioned on this head that he was forty. "Dear me," said his royal interlocutor, "you look very young for that. How do you account for it?" "By the fact that I have been travelling for a month in the superb climate of your Majesty's dominions," was the courtier-like and ready reply. The royal surprise on learning that the English ex-Minister was not related to his sovereign, as he would necessarily have been as a qualification for such high office in Korea, was mitigated by the addendum that he was as yet an unmarried man, hinting at the possibility of a future alliance with royalty.

A country full of anomalies, where the culture of the potato is a criminal offence, despite frequent famines from the failure of other crops, where the king's name must never be spoken outside his own household, and he must go down to posterity even by a pseudonym, and where every one paints and writes verses, is well worthy of European study.

The Ascent of Man. By Professor H. DRUMMOND. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1894.

PROFESSOR DRUMMOND'S volume is written in so fascinating a style that it is not easy at first to disentangle his argument from the eloquence with which it is supported, and to disparage by dissent a theory so persuasively advocated. His main object is to show that there is a natural basis for ethics in the maternal instinct of self-sacrifice divinely implanted in the lower animals, in which he sees the germ of all future developments of human love and benevolence. He thus makes the unselfish devotion designed to secure the survival of the race, the supreme law of nature, relegating to the second place the purely egotistical promptings of the struggle for life on the part of the individual. This idea is worked out in a series of brilliant chapters, in which he gives a glowing picture of the evolution of the perfected human body from its supposed ancestors in the lower kingdoms of nature. He lays too much stress, however, on the

theory of the identity of the early stages of life in the individual and in the species, according to which the former only comes to maturity after passing through the phases by which the latter ascended from the lowest to the highest form of being. This theory is controverted by the most eminent modern biologists, and even the supposed facts on which it was based are no longer considered so certainly ascertained as they were once assumed to be.

Les Origines du Concordat. Par LÉON SÉCHÉ. Paris: Librairie Delagrave. 1894.

IN these two massive volumes the author reviews the whole history of the negotiations which resulted in the Concordat of 1801, the basis of that reconstruction of society in France which it was the lasting triumph of Napoleon to have achieved. The aim of the work is to prove that, contrary to the received opinion, it was already in contemplation previous to the conclusion of the Treaty of Tolentino in 1797, and that only the implacable hatred of religion by the Directory delayed for four years longer the restoration of peace with the Church. "The Directory," he says in his Preface, "which had inherited all the anti-religious rancours of the Revolution, wished to put a definitive end to the spiritual and temporal power of the Church and dreamed of establishing on the ruins of the pontifical monarchy a great Roman republic." The secularisation of Rome was thus a task the fulfilment of which was left as a legacy by the sectaries of the eighteenth to those of the nineteenth century.

L'Hymnologie dans l'Office Divin. Par le CHANOINE ULYSSE CHEVALIER. Paris: Picard Librairie, Rue Bonaparte, 82. 1894.

THE professed purpose of this scholarly brochure is to raise the question of restoring to the Roman Breviary the original versions of the sacred hymns which were altered in the seventeenth century. Perhaps one of the least justifiable results of the renaissance in matters ecclesiastical was the correction of the hymns in the Divine Office. It was a reformation in liturgy only in the same sense as the contemporary reformation was in religion, and it was due to much the same causes, though operating in less momentous matters. The Christian poets who had sung in the early centuries wrote in the later latinity current at the time. The rules of

prosody were of less importance to them than unction and dogmatic fitness of phrase. And they were guided in versification more by accent than quantity. These inaccuracies of metre and imperfections of style were supposed to be intolerable to the purists of the classical revival. Their polite ears were offended by medieval barbarisms, and the false quantities in the hymns moved them more to laughter than devotion. It mattered little that the hymns they despised were the work of saints and doctors of the Church, or that they were charged with holy memories of a thousand years, during which they had ministered to the aspirations of generations of pious souls. But their barbarous phrases, full of unction and mystical illusion, however, must be sacrificed to latinity and metre. *Accessit latinitas recessit pietas*. Nothing was sacred to the enlightened humanist who spoke of the Blessed Trinity and the Saints in terms of heathen mythology, and who would not read St. Paul lest it should spoil his Greek!

This movement in favour of a recension of the Church's hymnology which had been growing since the classical revival, culminated early in the seventeenth century, at which time Urban VIII. (Cardinal Barberini) committed the task to four Jesuit fathers, less famous for liturgical than for classical lore. Curiously enough the same Pope has earned unenviable repute for ruining the ancient buildings as well as the liturgy of Rome; he and his family being the subjects of the famous pasquinade: *Quod non fecerunt Barbari fecerunt Barberini*. A minor poet himself—as witness his hymns for St. Martinmas Day—Pope Urban was discreet enough not to take a personal part in the revision. But the work was done thoroughly by his delegates. The number of corrections they made was considerable, no less than 952 syllables being changed in eighty-two hymns—about twelve alterations a-piece. Some of the hymns suffered more than others; many were completely disfigured; and whilst the style itself of the new version is not always above reproach, in some cases the changes seem purely gratuitous; in the beautiful hymn for virgins, *Qui pascis inter lilia* is turned into *Qui pergis inter lilia*, with no gain to metrical accuracy, and with a total loss of the scriptural allusion. As might be expected the new version met with much opposition, and was only imposed by sheer weight of authority. According to our author the Lateran and Vatican Basilicas never accepted it, or rather gained exemption from its enforcement; the same privilege was extended to the Benedictines, whose breviary still retains the ancient and original versions. With the decline of the classical fever and a growing reverence for antiquity has risen a regret at the desecration of the traditional poetry of the Church. We are learning once more to prefer the

devout words of Gregory, Ambrose, or Prudentius to the frigid pedantry of obscure classicists. This reviving interest in Christian antiquities is leading to a study of all liturgical subjects, the latest outcome of which is this respectful and urgent request that the original hymns may be restored to the offices of the Church.

Canon Chevalier's pamphlet raises incidentally several points of interest. In the course of a learned sketch of the evolution of the Breviary he brings out the great influence which the monastic Order has had on a work so peculiarly its own as the Divine Office which, though its origin may be traced to Apostolic times, received its first great development from the monasteries and the monk-bishops of the East. In the West St. Benedict's influence upon it was considerable. Himself a Roman, and founding his monasteries in the vicinity of Rome, he naturally based his arrangement of the "Opus Divinum" on the ancient *cursus* of the Roman Church, which in its turn adopted many improvements from him. Some of these came through "the supreme reformer of the offices of the Roman Church St. Gregory the Great, who professed the rule and followed the office" of St. Benedict. M. Chevalier treats the controversy on this point as quite antiquated, and proceeds, with some further remarks, which are specially interesting in view of the projects for the new Metropolitan Cathedral:

After the example of his predecessor Pelagius II., who had called to the Lateran Church the monks whom the Lombards had driven from Monte Cassino, he himself (St. Gregory) established religious in many other churches of the Eternal City. Following his footsteps several of his successors in the chair of St. Peter down to the ninth century, adopted the same means to render the Divine Office more solemn, and caused monasteries to be built in connection with the principal basilicas of Rome, the Vatican, St. Paul's, St. Mary Major's, &c. (p. 14).

Traces of this monastic influence on the Divine Office are chiefly to be found in the institution of Compline, in the name given to Prime, and the form of the Little Hours. But its most noticeable result in connection with our present subject was the introduction of hymns into all the canonical hours. Christian poetry owes thus a double debt to the patriarch of Western monks, in whose cloisters so many of its earliest flights were winged, and where it found shelter during the storm of the paganised Renaissance.

The erudite brochure of which we have briefly indicated some of the contents is merely an introduction to a larger work on "The Liturgical Poetry of the Western Church." The Abbé Chevalier is already favourably known for his liturgical studies, and this brochure makes us look forward eagerly to the completed work which he is preparing.

J. I. C.

The Life of St. Teresa. By GABRIELA CUNNINGHAME-GRAHAM.
London : Adam and Charles Black. 1894.

IT seems a curious anomaly that a life of St. Teresa should be written in a spirit of enthusiastic admiration by one who does not share her faith. For the great reformer of the Carmelites was not one of those saints whom modern philosophy can condescend to patronise as philanthropists, while ignoring the higher impulses prompting their beneficence, since Teresa's life-work was devoted exclusively to spiritual aims, and her motive the enhancement of the Divine glory, not the alleviation of the material woes of humanity. Mrs. Graham is consequently betrayed into many inconsistencies and contradictions when trying to elucidate by the light of reason alone the nature of her inspiration, and the mystical aspect of her many-sided character. She does not, however, distort the facts, and is for the most part content to suppress her own views, and to narrate with the ardent sympathy of a devotee the story of a life whose real significance must, one would have thought, be lost upon her. Yet the greatness of her subject so completely possesses her as to exalt her work to a higher level than she herself consciously attains, giving us on the whole no inadequate picture of that vivid personality which dominates her thoughts as it did the entire religious life of the sixteenth century. The narrative is vivified by the author's intimate acquaintance with all its settings and surroundings, with those old-world Castilian towns little changed since Teresa trod their stony streets, as well as with the life and manners of Spain at the same date, which live again for us on her glowing pages. Despite a faulty style, often slipshod, and sometimes ungrammatical, she has the power of language which enables her to stir the imagination and sway the feelings of the reader, to revivify the past, and call up visions to the mind's eye. The subjoined passage is an example of that descriptive power which catches not only the outward aspect but the inner meaning of the scene portrayed :

What did Burgos look like to these old-world travellers, when travelling was travelling indeed, and towns and cities dawned on the traveller from afar, and grew larger and larger on his vision, as tired mule or donkey flagged wearily across the plain ; not as now, when you whiz into it in a railway train ? Then he saw what the nuns now saw as they pulled back the awning (for they were but women), a city such as you may see drawn by some monkish draughtsman in the vignette of an old missal, or some old, very old engraving. An irregular conglomerate of serried roofs and monastery towers, girt in with turreted walls and bridges, even as the race of fighters had fashioned it, jagged of outline, a little grayer than the sky, it looked as if it had lain there for ever—a small oasis of life cut out of the vastness of the plain. Ragged sky torn by the tempest ; lace-work spire shooting up against it ; smokeless, stately and grim, the city

lay dripping in the rain, moss-grown, gray, and faded on the low-lying banks of the Arlanzon. Away to the left, overlooking the water meadows where the stork mused gravely on the landscape, Las Huelgas, the proudest convent in all Spain, its aisles lined with tombs of kings and queens, above them the silken banner of the Miramolin rotting proudly to dust. Facing them an old tower on an eminence, mouldering even then, overshadowing the city as was but meet, as its owner had overshadowed it in life, even the Cid, the great Cid Campeador. And Teresa, as she watched it growing on her vision across the flooded water meadows, little recked that as Burgos—the capital of Spain long before Valladolid, the chiefest jewel in the Castilian crown—then lived on his memory, as if he, the stern old Gothic knight, had been its sole *raison d'être*, so, too, that wild old fortress town among the moorlands, which she had beheld for the last time, was to live on hers to all eternity.

Mrs. Graham is no less happy in her sketches of Teresa's contemporaries than in her vignettes of Spanish scenery. The beautiful Princess of Eboli, shrouded in the mystery of a tragic fate; her husband, Ruy Gomez, the royal favourite, the sainted hermit Catalina de Cardona, who fled the Court to live as a solitary in the wilderness, are some of those incidentally portrayed. Sometimes historical personages appear in an unexpected aspect, as when Ferdinand of Toledo, the stern Duke of Alva, the scourge of the Netherlands, is represented as "an old grey-headed man, reading Teresa's life, and meekly listening to the spiritual counsels and comfort of one of her bare-footed friars, professing that nothing could give him greater pleasure although it cost him many leagues to see the Mother Teresa."

Happy turns of speech too gem the pages, like the description of the populace of Seville where "every rascal was a gentleman, and every gentleman was a rascal," and the phrase in which Cervantes is spoken of as reading the chivalric romances, until "he laughed them into limbo." Foreign idioms, on the other hand, sometimes mar the author's English, as in the word "conserve," invariably substituted for preserve throughout the book. It is strange too, to find one so familiar with the ways of Southern Europe unaware that "Pascua Florida," like the "Pasqua Rosa" of the Italians, is not Easter but Whitsuntide, while remarking in a note that the date would have accorded better with that of the latter festival. A jarring note too is struck whenever she gives expression to her own views on religion, making the Catholic reader wish to be able to draw his pen through the few passages which thus deface what is otherwise a work of rare interest and merit.

Publications of the Catholic Truth Society. 18 West Square, London, S.E. 1894.

THE Report of the Catholic Truth Society for the current year, which was presented at the Preston Conference, is one of the most satisfactory of its recent publications; the new branches founded, the new works undertaken, and the latest statistics quoted, showing most forcibly what the Society has accomplished during the ten years since its reconstruction. Evidently the demand for cheap Catholic literature, and for an organisation to supply and distribute it was greater than could have been supposed. The vitality of the Society is well shown by the new branches it has put forth, such as those at Southwark, Liverpool, Manchester, and notably the national branch for Scotland, and the special branch for seamen. The Society's works too are extending in variety as well as amount. "A Manual of Church History" is far advanced towards completion. There is talk of publishing a cheap and attractive monthly magazine, and of engaging lecturers to follow and confute the Church Defence orators, whilst the attention of the Committee is being turned to providing

a large and varied selection of good and cheap pictures for Catholic schools and homes; and series of lives of the Fathers of the Church and of extracts from their writings; popular commentaries on the Holy Scriptures; histories of particular Churches; a book on our English cathedrals, and an abridged and cheap Catholic Dictionary (Report p. 5.)

Perhaps the figures given of the sale of the Society's publications form the most remarkable evidence of its usefulness. Some of them are worth quoting: Of the "Publications"—a series of volumes of miscellaneous reading—over 32,000 have been sold; of "Tales and Poems," 8313; "Biographies," 13,050; "English Martyrs," 4415; "Stories of the Seven Sacraments," 4441. Of shilling books the whole number hitherto sold has been 89,766; of sixpenny, 26,688; of fourpenny, 54,440; the total number of bound books amounting to 176,912! Of the "Simple Prayer Book" 300,000 have been sold, and of F. Clarke's "Meditation-books" no less than 364,000! During the past twelve months alone, exclusive of the simple prayer book, 248,000 penny pamphlets have been printed, 186,000 leaflets, and 13,000 at various prices. A circulation so vast as this might well tempt the ambition of our ablest writers. If we compare it with the limited circle of readers reached by our learned magazines and quarterlies, it will be seen what an opportunity for benefiting both our own people and outsiders is afforded by the Catholic Truth Society; and when the ablest pens at our disposal are attracted to

the cause, we shall have less of the cheap criticism which we have sometimes heard about the feebleness of some of its productions.

Amongst the most recent publications we would draw attention to Lady Herbert's account of her own conversion to the faith,—"How I came home." The personal element in an autobiography of this kind always makes it interesting; and as example is better than precept, the simple story of the search after truth by one so well known as its writer is likely to prove helpful to others in similar trials. To the same indefatigable pen we owe two contributions to the biographical series: "A Siberian Priest," and the very touching "Life of St. Monica."

Several new leaflets are added to the already large supply, and some penny issues, notably "A Book of the Mass." We notice one slight blot on Canon Foran's excellent and effective lecture, "All about Monks and Nuns," viz. on page 4, where he unearths a now monastic order called the "Sons of St. Gregory," of whose foundation, however, by that saint history bears no trace, and which seems to have very soon vanished unaccountably into space. No doubt the author was relying on the now quite discredited theory of Baronius which Longard followed; but in a note he half apologises for the statement in the text, and he gives up the whole point by saying that "the rule of their father St. Gregory was fashioned on the Benedictine model." St. Benedict's rule has always been strong enough and living enough to admit of growth, and the changes sanctioned by St. Gregory were only its adaptation to fresh environment and to the needs of the Church. In a pamphlet so widely circulated as Canon Foran's it was a pity not to have altered the inaccurate phrases in the text.

We are glad to notice, finally, that the Catholic Truth Society is not overlooking the temperance cause and the special needs of the Church in Wales.

The Life of Blessed Anthony Baldinucci. By FRANCIS GOLDIE, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 1894. (Quarterly Series.)

THE life of this holy man, an eminent missionary of the Society of Jesus in the concluding years of the seventeenth century, who was beatified last year, has never before been brought into public notice. Yet Anthony Baldinucci was a very remarkable man. Refined, gentle, nervous and spiritual by nature, he laboured in the missions for over twenty years with all the sacrifice and ardour of a

Segneai, but with ideas and methods of his own. His chief missionary head quarters seem to have been at Frascati, and he never went further north than Perugia or beyond Terracina in the south. He was marvellously successful in restoring faith and morality among the poor country populations of Central Italy. He did not succeed so well in large towns—or rather, perhaps, with those set sermons which it was the fashion to preach during Lent and Advent. But he drew after him in crowds those hard-worked and very poor peasants who live high up in the hill-towns of these regions and go down to their work in the valleys. Father Goldie has drawn largely on a very extensive collection of his letters which has been preserved. Blessed Anthony was one of those men whose very countenance—with its pallor and flashing eyes—converted his hearers; but he practised, besides, all those austerities and all those holy arts of which we read in the career of Italian missionaries. Two of his peculiar practices may be noted. He was always most anxious that the people who assembled for the exercises of the mission should be provided with hymn-books; would hymn-books have been of much use to an English crowd in 1700? He distinguished himself by his solicitude to provide work for the people among whom he moved; and we read that in Frascati and other places he set on foot factories and work-shops, especially for the sake of the young girls.

Letters to Persons in Religion, and Letters to Persons in the World. By ST. FRANCIS DE SALES. Translated by Very Rev. Canon MACKAY, O.S.B., with Introductions by Bishop HEDLEY. xxxvi.—443 and xxxi.—463 respectively. London: Burns & Oates. 1894.

IT would be quite superfluous for us to say anything in favour of the admirable letters of the great and saintly Bishop of Geneva. For centuries they have been recognised as masterpieces of piety, gentleness, and sound sense, and read with profit and delight. The present collection is enhanced by the fact that it contains much which has never been presented to the public. Within the two volumes heading this notice, almost every topic of interest has been touched upon, and it would be difficult for any one in doubt or perplexity or spiritual trouble to pick them up without finding something to meet his own case, and to throw light upon his own difficulties. There are letters addressed to ladies, old and young, unmarried, married and widows, as well as to men of the world

in almost every condition of life. We will select a few passages as specimens.

In writing to console a lady on the death of her husband, he says:—

I consider that you have so much charity and fear of God, that seeing His good pleasure and holy will, you will conform yourself to it, and will soften your sorrow by the consideration of the evil of this world, which is so miserable that, but for our frailty, we should rather praise God when He takes from it our friends, than trouble ourselves about it. It is necessary that all, one after another, should quit it in the order which is appointed; and the first are the best off, when they have lived with care of their salvation and soul. . . . Sorrow is not forbidden us provided that we moderate it by the hope which we have of not remaining separated, but in a little time of following him to heaven, the place of our repose, God giving us this grace. There shall we form and enjoy without end good and Christian friendships, which in this world we have only begun (p. 129-130).

To a lady confined to bed by a disagreeable illness, he gives the following advice:—

I understand, my dear daughter, that you have an illness, more troublesome than dangerous, and I know that such illnesses are prone to spoil the obedience we owe to the doctors; wherefore I tell you not to deprive yourself of the rest, or the medicines, or the food, or the recreations appointed to you. You can exercise a kind of obedience and resignation in this which will make you extremely agreeable to our Lord. In fine, behold a quantity of crosses and mortifications, which you have neither chosen nor wished. God has given you them with His holy hand: receive them, kiss them, love them (p. 217).

To a gentleman of the world who had asked him a question concerning the interpretation of Holy Scripture, he sent a letter containing the following:

Sir,—It is very true that the Sacred Scripture contains with much clearness the doctrine required for your salvation, and I never thought the contrary. It is also true that it is a very good method of interpreting the Sacred Scriptures to compare passages with one another, and to reduce the whole to the analogy of the faith; that also I have ever said. But, all the same, I cease not to believe quite certainly, and to say constantly, that in spite of this admirable and delightful clearness of the Scriptures on things necessary for salvation, the human spirit does not always find the true sense of it, but can err, and in fact very often does err, in the intelligence of passages which are the most clear and the most necessary for the establishment of the faith. Witness the Lutheran errors, and the Calvinist books, which, under the conduct of the fathers of the pretended Reform, remain in irreconcilable contradiction on the meaning of the words of institution of the Blessed Eucharist. While both sides boast of having carefully and faithfully examined the sense of these works [mistake for “words”?] by comparing other passages of Holy Writ, and adjusting the whole to the analogy of faith, they still remain opposed in their way of understanding words of such great importance. Scripture then is plain in its words, but the heart of man is dim-sighted, and, like a night owl, cannot see this brightness (p. 189).

To a young lady intent upon marriage he writes:—

The state of marriage is one which requires more virtue and constancy than any other; it is a perpetual exercise of mortification; it will perhaps be so to you more than usual. You must then dispose yourself to it with a particular care, that from this thyme-plant, in spite of the bitter nature of its juice, you may be able to draw and make the honey of a holy life. May the sweet Jesus be ever your sugar and your honey to sweeten your vocation; ever may He live and reign in our hearts (p. 18).

We will conclude with a quotation from a letter addressed to M. Favre, in which the saint speaks of his own feelings and hopes as regards eternity:—

We cannot [he writes] have any more solid consolation in this life than that of being assured that it gradually disappears to make room for that holy eternity which is prepared for us in the abundance of God's mercy. To this eternity our soul aspires incessantly by the continual thoughts its very nature suggests to it, though it cannot have hope for eternity except by other and higher thoughts which the author of nature bestows upon it. Truly, I never think of eternity without much sweetness; for, say I, how could my soul extend its thought to this infinity unless it had some kind of proportion with it? Certainly a faculty which attains an object must have some sort of correspondence with it. But when I find that my desire runs after my thought upon this same eternity, my joy takes an unparalleled increase, for I know that we never desire anything which is not possible. My desire then assures me that I can have eternity; what remains for me but to hope that I shall have it. And this is given to me by the knowledge of the infinite goodness of Him who would not have created a soul capable of thinking of and tending towards eternity, unless He has intended to give the means of attaining it (p. 461-2).

The translator, we think, has done his work fairly well. The collocation of words, the order of clauses and sentences, and the general formation of some of the phrases have not always the pure idiomatic ring about them which we would like, and in some instances the modes of expression too irresistibly remind us of the language from which they have been drawn. Even in the above quotations, there are sentences which—while grammatically correct—would never have been written by an Englishman, unless writing as a translator.

A Practical Commentary on Holy Scripture. For the use of Catechists and Teachers. By FREDERICK JUSTUS KNECHT, D.D. Translated from the tenth German edition. Preface by Rev. MICHAEL F. GLANCEY. Two vols. 8vo (xxxvi.—982 pp.). Price 9s.; half morocco, 11s. 9d. First volume: The Old Testament (xxviii.—438 pp.). Second volume: The New Testament (viii.—544 pp.).

THESE two volumes of commentary on Holy Scripture will meet a widely felt need, and will be much prized not only by the religious instructors in our schools and colleges, but also by many a busy and hard-working priest on the mission. The first volume deals with the Old and the second with the New Testament. The chief events narrated in the Bible are told in simple and clear language, and the lessons they are intended to convey are pointed out in such a manner that the simplest reader may readily understand them. In fact the doctrines of the Church, especially as relating to the Commandments and the Sacraments, are beautifully illustrated and explained by examples from the inspired pages. Such a system cannot but impress a child far more deeply than any mere repetition of dry formularies, and will secure his interest and attention in a degree which, in any other way, would be impossible.

As a specimen, let us reproduce the commentary upon the murder of Abel by his brother Cain. After describing the event on pages 33, 34, 35, and 36, the author offers the following remarks:

(1) *God is omniscient.* God knew the minds of both Cain and Abel. He saw Cain's envy and bloodthirstiness, and knew what crime he had committed, even though Cain would not acknowledge it.

(2) *God is holy.* Therefore the offering of the righteous Abel was well pleasing to Him, but He took no pleasure in the offering of the evil-minded Cain.

(3) *God is just.* In what way did God show His justice in this story? First by the words: "If thou do well, shalt thou not receive?" and those other words: "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me." Also by the fact that He punished the murderer most terribly.

(4) *Envy is a capital sin.* Because, as we have seen, in the case of Cain, it leads to many other sins. To begin with, Cain was envious of his brother, and then, because he did not check this feeling, there grew up in his heart a fierce anger against Abel. He did not resist this anger, but rather cherished it, so that it turned into bitter hatred, and kindled in his heart the terrible desire to kill his brother. Then, as he did not resist this thirst for blood, it grew until at last it led him to commit the horrible crime of fratricide.

(5) *Murder.* The deadly blow which Cain dealt Abel was intentional and deliberate, and such an action is called murder. Cain was not only a murderer, but also a fratricide—i.e., the murderer of his brother.

(6) *The sins which cry to Heaven for vengeance.* We can see by this story of Cain and Abel, whence comes the expression of sins crying to

heaven for vengeance. Wilful murder is counted among them because of the words of God: "The blood of thy brother crieth," &c.

(7) *The forgiveness of sins.* Is it true that Cain might have obtained forgiveness if he had done penance? His sin was indeed great, but God's mercy is infinitely greater, and the murderer would have been forgiven by God if he had but repented and confessed his terrible sin. Our faith teaches us that all sins can be remitted if only they are confessed with proper dispositions. It was Cain's own fault that he did not obtain forgiveness. He would not confess his sin, though God Himself questioned him. We cannot get our sins forgiven unless we confess them. Cain also had no true contrition, and all hope of pardon depends on that. He, however, had given up hope, and despaired of God's mercy.

(8) *Free will.* There are those who yield to their evil passions, and then say that they could not help it. Is it true that they could not have helped it? Could not Cain have acted differently from what he did? God Himself had said to him: "Keep away from sin." We are not obliged to follow our evil inclinations, for we have free will, and can overcome our passions if we choose.

(9) *The necessity of grace.* Grace is, however, necessary to enable the free will of man to choose what is right. Cain had received quite sufficient grace, and if he had corresponded with it, he would have been quite able to overcome his envy and hatred, and would never have become a murderer.

(10) *Abel is the second type of Jesus Christ.* Abel was just; a shepherd, envied by his brother, slain by him; and his blood cries for vengeance. Jesus Christ is the most Just, and the Good Shepherd of mankind. Out of envy He was persecuted and slain by His brethren, the Jews. His blood cries for grace and pardon for sinful man. The homeless wandering Cain is a type of the *Jewish people*, who resisted God's grace, and who, since they slew their God, have been homeless and scattered over all the earth. *Eve*, weeping over the body of her beloved son, slain by the hand of his brother is a type of the *sorrowful mother of God, who stood sorrowing at the foot of the Cross*, on which hung her Divine Son, slain by his brethren, the Jews.

Then follows the "Application." The above is a fair specimen of the treatment which the different events in Holy Scripture meet with in this work, and the general method followed by the author.

One of the most valuable features of the whole, is the "Concordance between Holy Scripture and the Catechism," to be found at the end of the second volume. It begins on page 512, and occupies thirty-two pages, and will prove of the greatest use both to preachers and to those engaged in controversy and in the defence of the Church's teaching at least against persons still professing belief in the inspired volume. Both volumes are well printed and enriched with a large number of good illustrations.

Lexicon Syriacum auctore Carolo Brockelman. Praefatus est TH. NÖLDEKE. T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh.

WE cordially welcome this Lexicon as a most important addition to the collection of Syriac literature and a great help to students of Semitic languages. As Hebrew and Arabic are already in possession of several lexicons, a complete and standard Lexicon of Syria, such as Mr. Brockelman has given us, was certainly a desideratum. Possibly the scholar, thoroughly conversant with Hebrew, Biblical and Talmudic Aramaic, and possessed with a fair knowledge of Greek, might, after having mastered the Syriac characters and rudiments of its grammar, experience comparatively little difficulty in translating Syriac; yet the knowledge of Syriac is of so great importance for the study of the New Testament and of patristic literature, that one might with good reason apply himself to the study of Syriac even before a sufficient acquaintance with Hebrew has been obtained.

As far as the first part published permits us to form a judgment, we do not hesitate to say that the present work shows signs of great learning and skill, and is undertaken in a thoroughly scientific manner. A long list of Syriac works—amongst which we gladly notice those of the eminent Catholic scholars, Pr. Bickell, Mgr. Abbeloos, and Mgr. Lamy—referred to in the lexicon proves that it is the fruit of great labour and genuine scholarship. And if there still existed any doubt on this point, the name alone of the well-known Syriac scholar, Pr. Th. Nöldeke, would be sufficient to convince us that this lexicon is a work of the greatest value.

We very much approve also of the plan followed by the author of adding in Greek characters the corresponding Greek word, whenever a Syriac word is of Greek origin, for this makes the word familiar to the student, and helps him at once to ascertain its true meaning.

The present part, consisting of eighty pages, contains the first four letters of the alphabet, and consequently leads us to expect four other parts of at least similar dimension. The printer's work is done with great care, and the lexicon has been got up in a very neat and elegant manner.

Divine Love and Love of God's Blessed Mother. By Right Rev. J. F. WELD, Protonotary Apostolic. 8vo, pp. 563.

ACCORDING to the words of our Lord, man's duty on earth is to love God with his whole heart, mind, and strength. And R. Paul tells us herein we have the sum of perfection, since "He

that loveth hath fulfilled the law." It cannot be doubted, however, that there are many earnest Christians whose love of God is much spoilt by fear of His vengeance ; and there are others who find no little difficulty in reconciling the actual events of life with the notion of a God all love and goodness. Thus, for instance, how often do we see the wicked man prosper and the just man unable to succeed ? or how often does death rob a home of its mother and leave a houseful of young children to be dragged up anyhow by a drunken father ? or see again collisions on the railways, explosions in coal mines, calamities at sea. And God sees all these miseries and could prevent them. Hence arise in certain minds hard thoughts of God which hinder the heart from going out to Him with entire love and perfect confidence. To remove these hard thoughts and to present God in all His loveliness is the scope of this work. Mgr. Weld brings to his task a cultured mind, long experience, practical and tender piety. It embodies the substance of his spiritual discourses, retreats and reflections of the last fifty years. From the first page to the last there is not a single quotation from the Fathers, theologians, or ascetical writers. The rev. author pours out the wealth of his own thoughts, while the frequent quotations from Scripture give light and weight to his words. The meditations are positive as well as negative. Not satisfied with answering objections, they unfold to the reader, in simple yet elevated language, the proofs of God's love in the trial and triumph of the angels, in the creation and fall of man, in the Incarnation of the Word, and in Mary's peerless love for the children of Eve. Notwithstanding the solid proofs of God's love which the author exemplifies in many forms and ways, he does not profess to remove every difficulty, but when the difficulty appears to be insoluble, he goes to the key. Thus :

I have a sum in arithmetic to do, and I know from the key what the answer is, but I wish to work it out myself. If my solution differs from the key, I know that I am wrong, and I try again until my answer agrees with the true solution. In like manner, when I go to our Lord to learn truth and study His ways, He tells me to go to His loving heart, because it is the key which shows what all His truth and ways really are and must be, no matter how unintelligible to me (p. 9).

The book consists of 563 pages, and divides itself into eight parts. Space forbids us to name even the headings of the various meditations, but we may say in brief Part I. brings us to the Sacred Heart as the key which unlocks every problem, tells how Mary's love leads sinners to her Son ; discourses of the incomparable beauty of Jesus Christ, of His love manifested throughout all the world ; how sin

intercepts that love, and how the sensible effects of that love are sometimes withheld for the greater perfection of the soul.

In Part II. the purpose of our life on earth is explained to be nothing else and can be nothing else except to love God. The school in which we learn love is the Sacred Heart; that heart is wounded by unrequited love; the signs of our possessing love of God are given; we are instructed in the purpose of God scourging in time those whom He will love for eternity.

Part III. is particularly interesting. A strong imagination enables the author to picture in vivid colours the angels of God upon their trial. His conception of the two archangels, Michael and Lucifer, is truly grand. The method of the trial, also the action of all the parties, the words spoken, the skilful manner in which God's foreknowledge of Mary's consent to the Incarnation is made to decide the issue, are all touched with a dignity and majesty worthy of the sublimity of the theme.

Part IV. describes creation of the world and of man. This, of course, is a familiar story and the reader may be tempted to skip it. In that case he would miss some most instructive meditations, for in this part the work of creation and the future redemption are interwoven, and we see, what indeed must have been the case, how God's knowledge of the future influenced Him, if we may so speak, in creating. To take for example a passage which suggests what was in the mind of God when He said: "Let the earth bring forth the green herb," &c.:

I saw great fields covered with flowering wheat, which waved like seas of purest gold, in the brilliant dawn of eternal light which shone down upon them; and it was the breath of the great Creator, breathing on those golden ears of wheat, which caused them to wave like the waters of the mighty ocean, and they seemed to bear Him on their bosom and carry Him to those who loved Him. Then a most delicious odour ascended to His very throne, and also seemed to bear Him thence, to his beloved children. . . . It was the sweet odour of the flowering vine. Then I saw that the brightest angels looked down from heaven, and gladly would they have been transformed into that golden wheat, and ground into bread, or have replaced the fruit of the vine, and been trodden in the wine-press that stood close by (p. 245).

Part V. draws a graphic picture of the inroad of self-love on the hearts of Adam and Eve, and the catastrophe of the Fall. It is the general belief our first parents repented and are saved. But what moved Adam to contrition? Mgr. Weld puts his repentance on higher ground than loss of heaven or fear of hell—he conceives that God revealed to him the future Saviour.

Parts VI., VII., and VIII. deal especially with God's Blessed

Mother. This portion of the work, occupying over 200 pages, is rich in instruction and most suggestive of pious reflection. Many will consider it the best part of the book. It gives us a sublime idea of Mary's sanctity and sweetness, and of the tremendous part she played in bringing about our redemption. We cannot quote extracts, for already we see the shadow of the Editor's scissors upon our page, yet the treatise is well worthy of careful study.

It would have been well had the introduction to several of the meditations been shortened, and for usefulness a good index is very desirable. These slight faults, however, do not materially affect the value of the work, and we recommend it to all who have taste for spiritual things. It is brimful of holy thoughts, it is very suggestive; in a few places it is somewhat profound, yet as a whole it is quite within the compass of the ordinary reader. We feel sure that no one will rise from its perusal without an enlarged idea of the love of God and of our Lady, nor yet without a feeling of veneration for its author, to whom indeed the work has been a labour of love. Mgr. Weld, besides the authorship, bears the cost of printing and binding, and, except the copies sent to the clergy, gives all copies of the book to Joseph's College, Mill Hill, to be sold for the benefit of the Foreign Missions. It may be procured, post free, for the small cost of 3s. L. D. S.

Dante's Divina Commedia: Its Scope and Value. From the German of FRANZ HETTINGER, D.D., Professor of Theology at the University of Wurzburg. Edited by HENRY SEBASTIAN BOWDEN, of the Oratory. Second edition. Revised. London: Burns & Oates. 1894.

NEARLY ten years ago, on the publication of the first edition of this book, the late Cardinal Manning wrote to Father Bowden: "You have conferred a true benefit upon us by publishing Dr. Hettinger's work on Dante. It will be not only a signal help to readers of the *Divina Commedia*, but it will, I hope, awaken Catholics to a sense of the not inculpable neglect of the greatest of poets, who by every title of genius, and by the intensity of his whole heart and soul, is the master-poet of the Catholic Faith." We are glad to see that a second edition of the work has been called for, though we suspect that a very considerable portion of the first has found its way into the hands of non-Catholic students of the poet. But whether Catholics or non-Catholics take up this introductory commentary they will find in Hettinger and his English editor, reliable

guides to an aspect of the *Divina Commedia* that is too often overlooked or misinterpreted. The poem is essentially the work of a theologian, yet how many commentators devote themselves to elaborate investigations into the politics and the history of the period, and write as if Dante, the Ghibelline partisan, were the personality chiefly revealed in this mystic pilgrimage through the unseen world? Hettinger's merit is that he reads the verse of Dante in the light of those same teachers to whom Dante himself appeals as the source of his inspiration. Without neglecting the literary and the historical element in the *Divina Commedia*, he dwells mostly upon its philosophy and theology. To those who have attempted to read Dante by the light of the merely literary commentators, this great Catholic critic opens up a new world of beauty and truth, and Father Bowden's translation, or rather adaptation of the German original, makes this key to Dante available to what we hope will be an ever-increasing number of Catholic students of "this mediæval miracle of song."

Reviews in Brief.

The Mysteries of the Holy Rosary. An easy method of reciting the prayers and meditating on the Mysteries. Freiburg: Herder. 1893. Pp. 63.—This small book is furnished with the recommendation of several bishops. It is adorned with suitable illustrations, and will prove a useful help in reciting the Rosary. The prayers are short but suggestive, and adapted to the understanding even of little ones. The book is concluded by eighteen prayers indulged by the Holy See.

Deharbe's Small Catechism. Translated from the German. Pp. 66. Price 3d. Freiburg: Herder. 1893.—This catechism is destined for the first classes of elementary schools, and from its brevity and clearness will prove to be an excellent aid.

The Maiden's Progress. By VIOLET HUNT. London: Osgood & M'Ilvaine. 1894.—This short novel in dialogue is a brilliant satire on some aspects of the society of the present day, and has a deeper meaning underlying its bright persiflage as a study of that product of modern life the girl up to date, without religion, sense of duty, or even much capability for natural affection to hold in check the vagaries of her undisciplined imagination. Discontent with life and all it has to offer her is the key-note of her character, and frivolity, selfishness, and vanity dictate all her actions. Moderna, the heroine of the present volume, is one of the least odious of the species, and her follies are more superficial than inherent. Many other social types of the day are sketched with suggestive touches that convey the speaker's mental attitude in a few words.

Sarah, a Survival. By SIDNEY CHRISTIAN. London: Sampson Low. 1894.—We confess to have experienced a slight sensation of disappointment at the somewhat ignoble ending of the high-spirited and lofty-minded Sarah Thornborough. Having committed the mistake so common among heroines, of engaging herself to a man to whom she is absolutely indifferent, she proceeds to retrieve matters by undisguisedly showing preference for another. The latter proves so coy, that she has eventually to propose for him, after hunting him

up in his lodgings for the purpose. Yet despite these blemishes the book is not without charm, and the description of Sarah's childhood and surrounding has the indefinable quality which painters call atmosphere. A sympathetic description of the Basques and their country is incidentally introduced.

The Real Charlotte. By E. E. SOMERVILLE AND MARTIN ROSS. London: Ward & Downey. 1894.—The joint authors of "An Irish Cousin" give here a picture of Irish life which is undeniably powerful, yet unpleasant and misleading. There is no society, as none ought to know better than Miss Somerville, more exclusive than that of the county gentry of Ireland, yet she represents the Charlotte of her title-page as admitted into its charmed circle, though saturated with that unredeemed lowness which includes vileness of mind and character. Neither could her pretty protégée, Francie, ever have been tolerated by ladies in any country, as her thoughts and ways were those of the least cultivated of factory hands.

Books Received.

Theologia Dogmatica Generalis. G. David. Lyons: E. Vitte.
2 vols. 8vo, pp. 934.

A Retreat, consisting of Thirty-three Discourses, with Meditations for the use of the Clergy. By the Right Rev. Cuthbert Hedley, Bishop of Newport and Menevia. London: Burns & Oates.

Catechism of Humility. Mother Elizabeth of the Cross. Washbourne. 12mo, pp. 154.

The Rambler's Return. Rev. M. Horgan. Louth: Goulding. Brochure, pp. 88.

Hospitaller Knights of St. John. Rev. J. Bowen. London and Leamington: Art & Book Co. Pp. 32.

Easy Selections from Herodotus. A. C. Liddell, M.A. London: Methuen. Pp. xi.-84.

History of the Papacy During Reformation. Dr. Creighton. Longmans. Vol. V. 8vo, pp. 384.

Divorce Report as Received by the Lower House of Convocation of York. Sampson Low & Co. Pp. 106.

Christianity and the Roman Government. E. G. Hardy, M.A. Longmans. 8vo, pp. xv.-208.

Distinguished Irishmen of Sixteenth Century. Rev. E. Hogan, S.J. Burns & Oates. 8vo, pp. ix.-506.

Letters and Writings of Marie Lataste. E. H. Thompson, M.A. Burns & Oates. Vol. III. 8vo, pp. 202.

Anecdota Oxoniensia. Edited by Kuno Meyer. Clarendon Press. Part VIII. Pp. 91.

L'Université Catholique de Fribourg. C. Morel. Arras: Sueur Charruey. Pp. 51.

- De la Necessité de Développer les Etudes Scientifiques.** Rev. J. Zahm, C.S.C. Brussels: par Polleunis et Auterick. Brochure, pp. 28.
- Only a Child's Story.** Mrs. W. Maude. Catholic Truth Society. 8vo, pp. 187.
- The Heart and Songs of the Spanish Sierras.** G. W. White. Fisher Unwin. 8vo, pp. 197.
- Key to Carroll's Geometry.** Burns & Oates. Pp. 48.
- A Constant Lover.** Translated from German by John Nisbet. Fisher Unwin. 8vo, pp. 193.
- Aventures et Guerre d'Amour de Baron Cormatin.** H. Welschinger. Paris: Plon Nourrit. 8vo, pp. 290.
- Some Aspects of Disestablishment.** Edited by H. C. Shuttleworth. London: Innes & Co. 8vo, pp. x.-192.
- The Monastery of the Grande Chartreuse.** By a Carthusian Monk. Burns & Oates. 8vo, pp. xlvii.-234.
- L'Abbaye du Mont St. Michel.** G. de Bouchet. Paris: Lethiellieux. 8vo, pp. 297.
- A Life's Decision.** T. W. Allies. Burns & Oates. 8vo, pp. xvi.-320.
- Epitome Synodorum.** London: Art & Book Co. Brochure, pp. 41.
- Mission Providentielle de Jeanne d'Arc.** Ollivier, O.P. Paris: Lethiellieux. Pp. 29.
- Records Relating to Dioceses of Ardagh and Clonmacnoise.** Canon Monaghan. Dublin: Gill & Son. 8vo, pp. ix.-400.
- Occasional Essays.** S. Chatard, D.D. New York: C. P. S. 8vo, pp. 376.
- Theory of Inference.** Rev. H. Hughes, M.A. Kegan Paul. 8vo, pp. vi.-256.
- Attitude of Church of England to Non-Episcopal Ordinations.** W. Firminger, B.A. Southampton Street, London: J. Parker & Co. Brochure, pp. xiv.-75.

The Portraits of St. Bernard. Samuel Eales. Innes & Co. Brochure, pp. 19.

Saint Sacrifice de la Messe. N. Gühr. Lethiellieux. 8vo, pp. 419, Vol. I.; pp. 458, Vol. II.

Ueber die Entwicklung der Australischen Eisenbahnpolitik. M. Kandh. Berlin: Hans Mamroth. 8vo, pp. 34-258.

Cæremoniae Missarum Solemnium et Pontificalium. G. Schober. Ratisbon: Pustet. 8vo, pp. xii.-424.

Hierurgia. Dr. D. Rock. London: Hodges. Part I., pp. xiv.-32.

INDEX.

JULY—OCTOBER, 1894.

- ABYSSINIAN Border, 171.
Africa, Central, 175.
Africa, Franco-German, 174.
Africa, Italian, 170.
Aquitaine, Service Books of, 279.
Antiquities, Abyssinian, 172.
Archæology and Higher Criticism, 71.
Aristoteles-Lexikon, *noticed*, 473.
Ascent of Man, the, *noticed*, 474.
- BALDINUCCI, Life of Blessed Anthony, *noticed*, 481.
Ban of Maplethorpe, the, *noticed*, 467.
Barabbas, *noticed*, 463.
Bäumer, P. Suitbert, 245, 471.
Bedes, Bidding the, 162, 448.
Bells of N. D. de Bruge, *noticed*, 238.
Bible, the Pre-Reformation, 122.
Bishop, Edmund, 245.
Borghese, Life of Princess, *noticed*, 238.
Bowden, Rev. H. S., 490.
Brennan, Rev. R., 214.
British Association Meeting, 437.
British History and Papal Claims, *noticed*, 201.
Brockelman Carolus, 487.
Buckler, Rev. Reginald, 236.
- CAMBRIDGE Sermons, *noticed*, 196.
Capecelatro, Cardinal, 237.
Carbonic Acid, New Industrial Uses of, 436.
Carmina Mariana, *noticed*, 230.
Catechism, Explanation of Deharbe's Small, *noticed*, 236.
Charlotte, the Real, *noticed*, 493.
Chevalier, le Chanoine U., 475.
Christ has Come, *noticed*, 236.
Christian, S., 492.
Church and the Bible, 313.
Clarke, Rev. Robert F., 96.
Clerke, Miss E. M., 295.
Cloud Exhibition, 153.
Colet, Influence of Dean, *noticed*, 189.

Comedy of English Protestantism, the, *noticed*, 209.
 Commentary on Holy Scripture, *noticed*, 485.
 Confession, la, *noticed*, 210.
 Corelli, Marie, 463.
 Criticism, Higher, 71.
 Criticism, Textual, 30.
 Cunninghame-Graham, Mrs., 478.
 Curzon, Hon. G. N., 473.
 Custody of Children, Law as to, *noticed*, 239.
 Cyclonic Fogs, 435.

DANTE'S Divina Commedia, *noticed*, 490.
 D'Audiffret-Pasquier, M. le Duc, 222.
 Dering, E. H., 467, 468.
 Desailly, l'Abbé, 216.
 Desgardins, A., 218.
 Devine, Rev. A., 236.
 Diatessaron, Tatian's, *noticed*, 204.
 Dictionnaire Général de la Langue Française, *noticed*, 205.
 Didon, R. P., 221.
 Divine Love and Love of God's Blessed Mother, *noticed*, 487.
 Drummond, Professor, 474.
 Dukes, Clement, 233.

EAST Africa, Transport in, 457.
 Ehescheidung Heinrichs VIII., Römische Documente zur Geschichte
 der, *noticed*, 470.
 Ehses, Dr. Stephan, 470.
 Elizabeth and the Revolution, Queen, 358.
 Erskine, Hon. Stuart, 382.
 Europa's Moods, *noticed*, 467.
 Evangile et l'Apocalypse de Pierre, l', *noticed*, 202.
 Evetts, Basil T., 207.

FABER'S May Book, Father, *noticed*, 236.
 Fallen Angels, *noticed*, 238.
 Famille Chrétienne, la, *noticed*, 207.
 Felix, R. P., 210.
 Foi en la Divinité de Jésus Christ, la, *noticed*, 221
 Following of Christ, *noticed*, 236.
 Fountain Air Brush, 158.
 France Noire, la, *noticed*, 465.
 François de Sales, Œuvres de St., *noticed*, 191
 Franz Josef Land, 178.
 "Full of Grace," Note on Translation, 168.
 Fyllières, Camille, 238.

GASQUET, Dr. J. R., 342.
 Gasquet, Rev. F. A., 179.
 Geary, Nevill, 212.
 Gelasian Sacramentary, 275.
 Gillow, Joseph, 217.
 Glaubensbekenntniss, das apostolische, *noticed*, 471.
 Goldie, Rev F., 481.
 Great Pestilence, the, *noticed*, 179.
 Greek, the Language of Christ, *noticed*, 195.

HADRAMAUT, 176.
 Hampden-Cook, E., 236.
 Harrar, Visit to, 460.
 Haywarden, R. T., 463.
 Health at School, *noticed*, 233.
 Hegel, Logic of, *noticed*, 224.
 Hegel's Philosophy, Prolegomena to Study of, *noticed*, 223.
 Histoire du Règne de Marie Stuart, *noticed*, 211.
 Home Rule Bill, Lord Mar's, 382.
 Horgan, Rev. M., 238.
 Howlett, Very Rev. Canon, 71.
 Hügel, Baron von, 313.
 Hunt, Violet, 492.
 Hymnologie dans l'Office Divin, *noticed*, 475.

INFLUENCE of Dean Colet on the Reformation, *noticed*, 189.
 Italian Africa, 170.

JOAN of Arc, 295.

KAFFRISTAN, Explorations in, 458.
 Kappes, Dr. M., 473.
 Kent, Rev. W. H., 387.
 Kidd, Benjamin, 231.
 Kirchen-Lexicon von Wetzer und Welte, *noticed*, 468.
 Knecht, Dr. F. J., 485.

LAAGE, R. P. de, 207.
 Lageniensis, Poetical Works of, *noticed*, 199.
 Laud, Life of Archbishop, *noticed*, 184.
 Law of Marriage and Family Relations, *noticed*, 212.
 Leathley, Dudley W. B., 239.
 Letters to Persons in Religion, and to Persons in the World, *noticed*, 482.

Lexicon Syriacum, *noticed*, 487.
 Liberté Politique dans l'Etat Moderne, la, *noticed*, 218.
 Liquid Fuel, 432.
 Little Sisters of the Poor, *noticed*, 234.
 Lods, Adolphe, 202.
 Lourdes, 342.
 Louvagny, Mme. la Comtesse de Beaurepaire de, 238.
 Lucas, Rev. H., 30.
 Lupton, Rev. J. H., 189.

MACKE, Karl, 466.
 Mackenzie, G. T., 402.
 Mackey, Very Rev. Canon, 482.
 Maher, Rev. M., 204.
 Maiden's Progress, *noticed*, 492.
 Marlborough, 402.
 Marshall, A. F., 209.
 Mass-Book, Earliest Roman, 245.
 Maude, W. C., 239.
 Means of Grace, the, *noticed*, 214.
 Mediæval Records and Sonnets, *noticed*, 467.
 Milligan, W., 219.
 Modern Criticism and the Fourth Gospel, *noticed*, 206.
 Molinari, G. P. de, 222.
 Monnier, Marcel, 465.
 Month of Mary, *noticed*, 235.
 Month of St. Joseph, *noticed*, 235.
 Moyes, Very Rev. Canon, 411.
 Mysteries of the Holy Rosary, *noticed*, 492.

NAGUÈRE, Aujourd'hui, *noticed*, 238.
 Natal Astrology, *noticed*, 237.
 New Light on the Bible and Holy Land, *noticed*, 207.
 Nil zum Nebo, Vom, *noticed*, 466.

O'GRADY, Standish, 197.
 Origines du Concordat, les, *noticed*, 475.
 Outlines of Law as to Custody of Children, *noticed*, 239.

PAPAL Jurisdiction in Medieval England, 411.
 Paradis Terrestre, *noticed*, 216.
 Pasquier, Mémoires du Chancelier, *noticed*, 222.
 Passion, History of, *noticed*, 236.
 Paton, J., 201.

Peacock, Miss Florence, 30.
 Perfection of Man by Charity, *noticed*, 236.
 Pilate's Wife, *noticed*, 463.
 Pittite, A., 467.
 Poland, W. P., 228.
 Polar Expedition, American, 177.
 Polar Expedition, English, 458.
 Pre-Reformation Bible, 122.
 Primitive Church and See of Peter, 387.
 Primitive Church and See of Peter, *noticed*, 187.
 Prior, C. H., 196.
 Problems of the Far East, *noticed*, 473.

RAINY, Principal, 227.
 Ram, Mrs. Abel, 234.
 Rational Philosophy, *noticed*, 228.
 Resurrection of the Dead, *noticed*, 219.
 Rings, 30.
 Rivington, Rev. L. 187.
 Roberts, Professor, 195.
 Rosary, the, 444.
 Royal Society, Soirée, 159.

SARAH, a Survival, *noticed*, 492.
 Science et Religion, *noticed*, 222.
 Séché, Léon, 475.
 Sherborne, *noticed*, 468.
 Shipley, Orby, 230.
 Social Evolution, *noticed*, 231.
 Soudan, State of, 462.
 Spinoza, Ethic of, *noticed*, 228.
 Stirling, Amelia H., 228.
 St. Joseph, Life and Glories of, *noticed*, 235.
 Stone, Miss J. M., 358.
 Story of Ireland, *noticed*, 197.
 St. Philip Neri, Life of, *noticed*, 237.
 St. Thomas' Priory, *noticed*, 217.
 Supernatural in Christianity, the, *noticed*, 227.

TATIAN'S Diatessaron, *noticed*, 204.
 Teresa, Life of St., *noticed*, 478.
 Textual Criticism, 30.
 Thompson, Edward H., 235.
 Turacin, 156.
 Twigge, R., 279.

UGANDA, Sir G Portal on, 455.

VERE, Aubrey de, 467.

Villa Esculape, la, *noticed*, 238.

Vivisection Controversy, 96.

WALLACE, Professor, 223, 224.

Ward, William George, 1.

Watkins, H. W., 206.

Weld, Right Rev. Mgr., 487.

Wellman Expedition, 459.

Wilberforce, Wilfrid, 1.

William George Ward, 1.

Wilson, H. A., 245.

YEMEN, Journey Through, 172



Does Not Circulate

AP 4 .D8 SMC

The Dublin review.

AIP-2395 (awab)



